PATTERNS OF SUPPORT

THE USE OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG FAMILY PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO

by:

Margaret A. Denton
Christine K. Davis

With the assistance of
Brenda J. Nussey

SOCIAL DATA RESEARCH LIMITED
Hamilton, Ontario

The Ministry of Housing encourages the use of the
contents of this report where the user provides
due credit to the authors and publisher.

The views expressed in this report are those of the
authors and do not necessarily represent the
current or intended policies of any of the
government agencies which funded or
otherwise supported this study.

© Queen's Printer for Ontario, 1987

ISBN 0-7729-2025-7

Ministry of Housing
Ministère du Logement
Ontario

Mr. L. F. Pitura
Assistant Deputy Minister
Community Housing

January 9, 1986

Dear Mr. Pitura,

On behalf of the members of the steering committee I wish to express our pleasure in presenting the family report from the Survey of Support Service Use Among Public Housing Residents In Ontario.

The family report concludes the review of patterns of support service use among family and senior citizen public housing tenants by the steering committee. This report like the senior citizen report which preceded it, presents the facts as they were uncovered.

Unlike the senior citizen report there have been no parallel surveys of the public or groups of public housing tenants against which our results might be compared. This report must therefore be considered experimental primary research. The experimental status of this part of our work, diminishes neither the meaning of our findings nor the importance of undertaking research in uncharted waters.

During the family survey, the steering committee and the consulting firm which undertook the fieldwork were very impressed by the commitment made to family tenants by the staff of the local housing authorities involved in the survey.

Steering committee members wish to express their appreciation and thanks to the agencies which funded and otherwise supported this project, Social Data Research Limited which undertook the survey and authored the report, Ontario Housing Corporation and local housing authority staff which cooperated and assisted this effort, and especially to the tenants and the front line staff of the community service agencies interviewed either during the pretesting of the questionnaires or during the survey. Each of these parties contributed substantially to the success of this complex endeavour.

Yours sincerely,

George S. Hough

George S. Hough,
Steering Committee Chairman
Housing Supply Policy Branch

LIST OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS i

LIST OF TABLES iv

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS xi

FOREWORD xiii

HIGHLIGHTS xv

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN 1

- 1.1 Introduction and Purpose of this Survey 1
- 1.2 Study Design and Methodology 4

CHAPTER 2 AGENCY SURVEY FINDINGS 6

- 2.0 Introduction 6
- 2.1 Methodology 7
- 2.2 A Description of the Neighbourhood Where Housing Projects for Families are Located 10
- 2.3 Service Providers' Perceptions of Tenant Problems 20
- 2.4 Support Services Available to Family Tenants From Community Agencies 23
- 2.5 The Role of Agencies 33

CHAPTER 3 TENANT SURVEY FINDINGS 40

- 3.0 Introduction 40
- 3.1 Background Characteristics, Health Status, Tenant Problems and Social Networks 41
  - 3.1.A Background Characteristics 41
    - i) Demographic Characteristics 41
    - ii) Income 52
  - 3.1.B Health Status 58
  - 3.1.C Tenant Problems 61
  - 3.1.D Social Networks 70
- 3.2 Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living 77
- 3.3 Assistance Received With Activities of Daily Living 84
  - 3.3.A Assistance With Activities of Daily Living 84
  - 3.3.B Frequency of Assistance With Activities of Daily Living 86
  - 3.3.C Length of Time Help was Received with Activities of Daily Living 86
  - 3.3.D Duration of Assistance with Activities of Daily Living 89
  - 3.3.E Arrangements for Assistance With Activities of Daily Living 89
  - 3.3.F Use of Formal Services 92
- 3.4 Providers of Assistance With Activities of Daily Living 98

3.5 Factors Relating to the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support 101

3.5.1 Introduction 101
3.5.2 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Background Characteristics and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living 104
3.5.3 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Health Status and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activitties of Daily Living 105
3.5.4 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Frequency of Social Contact and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living 107
3.5.5 The Relationship Between the Number of Tenant Problems and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support With Activities of Daily Living 109
i) Life Stress 109
ii) Number of Problems Respondents Experienced by Children and Partners 111
iii) Extent of Difficulty Finding Enough Money 111
iv) The Relationship Between the Type of Tenant Problems and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living 116
3.5.6 The Relationship Between Municipality and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support for Activities of Daily Living 122
3.5.7 The Relationship Between the Receipt of Assistance From Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living 124
3.6 Sufficient Help With Activities of Daily Living 126

CHAPTER 4 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 131

Summary of Findings From the Agency Survey 132
Summary of Findings From the Tenant Survey 135

REFERENCES 150

APPENDIX 1 A PROFILE OF THE USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY FAMILY PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS: THE FREQUENCY OF ASSISTANCE; LENGTH OF TIME SERVICE WAS USED; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE AND WHETHER THE ASSISTANCE MET THE PERCEIVED NEED A1

A.1.0 Introduction A1
A.1.1 Health Services A2
A.1.2 School Social Workers A5
A.1.3 Mental Health Services for Adults A9
A.1.4 Mental Health Services for Children A13
A.1.5 Pre-School Child Day Care Programs A16
A.1.6 Help from the Police A20
A.1.7 Children's Aid Society A23
A.1.8 Family Counselling Services A27
A.1.9 Big Brothers/Big Sisters A30
A.1.10 Job Counselling A33
A.1.11 Education Upgrading Programs A37
A.1.12 Educational Community Information and Referral Service A40
A.1.13 Counselling on Family Law Matters A43
A.1.14 Project Staff A46
A.1.15 Family Benefits Workers A50
A.1.16 Other Income Maintenance A54
A.1.17 Recreational Community Drop-in Centres A59

APPENDIX 2 METHODOLOGY TABLES FOR THE AGENCY SURVEY A64

APPENDIX 3 METHODOLOGY: TENANT SURVEY A76

A.3.1 Study Population and Sampling Design A76
A.3.2 Census Demographics of Municipalities Surveyed A80
A.3.3 Questionnaire Design and Methodology A83
A.3.4 Fieldwork Procedure A84
A.3.5 Response Rates and Biases A85
A.3.6 Sample Bias A89
A.3.7 Coding A91
A.3.8 Data Entry, Editing and Analysis A92
A.3.9 Impressions of the Interviewers A93

APPENDIX 4 TENANT RESPONSE RATE TABLES A95

APPENDIX 5 QUESTIONNAIRES

LIST OF TABLES

Table

2.2.1 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Neighbourhood Surrounding the Families Housing Project - Percent of Responses by Predominant Type of Neighbourhood 11

2.2.2 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Residents in the Surrounding Neighbourhood - Percent of Responses by Predominant Type of Resident 12

2.2.3 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Socio-Economic Level of Households in the Families' Project Neighbourhood by Municipality 13

2.2.4 Support Service Providers' Ratings of Selected Neighbourhood Attributes (Per Cent of Responses Indicating Very Good or Excellent by Municipality) 15

2.2.5 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Location of Facilities in the Neighbourhood Surrounding the Families' Housing Project by Municipality (Per Cent of Responses Indicating Within Easy Walking Distance) 17

2.3.1 Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Tenant Problems (Per Cent of Responses Indicating Very Serious or Serious Tenant Problems by Municipality) 21

2.4.1 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Supports Available to Family Tenants 24

2.4.2 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Support Services Available to Families by Municipality (Responses Reporting that Service Meets Most Needs of Recipients) 27

2.4.3 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Use of Services by Family Tenants as Compared to the Community in General 29

2.4.4 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Reasons Why Family Tenants Do Not Use the Services They Need (Per Cent of Agency Responses that Ranked Each of the Following as Number One*) 32

2.5.1 The Frequency With Which Respondents Encountered Various Obstacles to Support Delivery 36

2.5.2 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Obstacles to the Delivery of Supports (Responses Indicating Obstacles Encountered Often by Municipality) 37

3.1.1 Family Public Housing Respondents by Age 42

3.1.2 Family Public Housing Respondents by Birthplace 43

3.1.3 Family Public Housing Respondents by Education 45

3.1.4 Family Public Housing Respondents by Employment Status 46

3.1.5 Family Public Housing Respondents by Number in Household 47

3.1.6 Family Public Housing Respondents by Number of Children in Household 48

3.1.7 Family Public Housing Respondents by Ages of Children 49

3.1.8 Family Public Housing Respondents by Ages of Children and by Number of Children in the Family 50

3.1.9 Family Public Housing Respondents by Activities of Children 51

3.1.10 Family Public Housing Respondents by Total Household Monthly Income - January/February, 1985 53

3.1.11 Family Public Housing Respondents, Household Monthly Income by Family Type - January/February, 1985 54

3.1.12 Family Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income by Number of Children in Family - January/February, 1985 55

3.1.13 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Frequency they Experienced Difficulty Finding Enough Money Each Month to Buy Food or Pay Rent 56

3.1.14 Family Public Housing Respondents by Source of Income 57

3.1.15 The Number of Health Conditions Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 59

3.1.16 The Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With the Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 60

3.1.17 Family Public Housing Respondents, Number of Problems Reported for Respondents, Spouse/ Friend and Children 62

3.1.18 Family Public Housing Respondents, Type of Problem Reported for Respondents, Spouse/Friends and Children 64

3.1.19 Family Public Housing Respondents and the Frequency of Children's Problems by Family Type 65

3.1.20 Family Public Housing Respondents by Frequency of Life Events 67

3.1.21 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Life Events Reported 69

3.1.22 Frequency and Type of Contact With Children, Relatives and Friends Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 71

3.1.23 Number of Social Contacts Per Month Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 73

3.1.24 Number and Percentage of Family Public Housing Respondents Reporting Children Living Elsewhere, Relatives and Friends on Whom They Can Depend by the Location of Contacts 74

3.1.25 Family Public Housing Respondents Turning to Various Sources of Support if They Needed Help for Problems they May Encounter 76

3.2.1 Family Public Housing Respondents: Their Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living, Their Receipt of Help and Their Ability to Get by Without the Help Received 79

3.2.2 Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 80

3.2.3 Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents 81

3.2.4 Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents by Number of Children 83

3.3.1 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living 85

3.3.2 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage with Difficulties who are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Frequency of Help Received 87

3.3.3 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living by Length of Time Help Received 88

3.3.4 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage with Difficulties who are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Duration of Help 90

3.3.5 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by How Help Was Arranged 91

3.3.6 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Number of Services Used 93

3.3.7 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used 94

3.3.8 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Proportion of Respondents who Are Not Able to Get By Without the Service and the Proportion of Respondents Who Are Only Able to Get By With a Lot of Difficulty Without the Service 95

3.3.9 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used by Family Type 97

3.4.1 Family Public Housing Respondents by the Percentage of Total Assistance Provided by Various Sources 99

3.4.2 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage of Activities of Daily Living by Source of Assistance 100

3.5.1 Summary of Significant Relationships Between the Frequency of Informal and Formal Assistance Received by Family Public Housing Respondents and Their Background Characteristics, Health Status and Frequency of Social Contact and Tenant Problems 103

3.5.2 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Number of Health Conditions Interfering A Little or A Great Deal With Daily Activities 106

3.5.3 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts Per Month 108

3.5.4 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Life Events Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months 110

3.5.5 Frequency of Formal and Informal Support Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Respondent's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months 112

3.5.6 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Child's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months 113

3.5.7 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Spouse's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months 114

3.5.8 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Extent of Difficulty Finding Enough Money 115

3.5.9 The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondent Over the Last Twelve Months 117

3.5.10 The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondent's Child/Children Over the Last Twelve Months 119

3.5.11 The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondent's Spouse Over the Last Twelve Months 120

3.5.12 Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Municipality 123

3.5.13 Frequency of Formal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Activities of Daily Living by the Frequency of Informal Assistance Reported With Activities of Daily Living 125

3.6.1 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Enough Help, Right Kind of Help 127

3.6.2 Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Ability to Get By 128

3.6.3 Assistance Received and Requests for Help by Family Public Housing Respondents Who Reported Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living and Who Did Not Receive Help 130

A.3.1 Survey of Service Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario Sampling Frame A78

A.3.2 Total Population and Population by Age Groups for Each Municipality (1981 Census) A81

A.3.3 Median Private Annual Household Incomes for Each Municipality (1981 Census) A82

A.3.4 Family Public Housing Tenants by the Target and Actual Number of Interviews A86

A.3.5 Family Public Housing Tenants by Fieldwork Report A87

A.3.6 Family Type and Sex of Household Heads in the Population of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario* in the Seven Municipalities Surveyed and in the Sample of Tenant Respondents A90

A.3.7 Family Public Housing Respondents, Survey Reliability as Reported by the Interviewers A94

A.4.1 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Status Report on Tenant Questionnaire Fieldwork A95

A.4.2 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Tenant Households Excluded From the Survey A96

A.4.3 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: In Depth Analysis of Refusals Seeking Refusals for Potential Medical Reasons A97

A.4.4 Survey of Support Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario: Summary of Tenant Refusals for Potential Medical Reasons A98

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Patterns of Support to Families Survey involved the combined efforts of many people, and the authors of this report wish to acknowledge their help.

In particular, we wish to thank members of the steering committee for their support, guidance and comments on earlier drafts of this report. They are: George Hough (chair), Ministry of Housing; Sylvia Goldblatt, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation; Dorothy Singer, Arlene Hoffman and Margaret Farina from the Ministry of Community and Social Services; David Kennedy, Office of Senior Citizens' Affairs; Joan Leslie, Anne Allin, Ontario Housing Corporation; Liz Lotto, Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited; and Esta Wall, Ministry of Health.

The development of a preliminary draft of the questionnaire under separate contract by Forma Consulting is also acknowledged.

Winnie Chan, from the Ministry of Housing, provided assistance with tables and graphic construction, and Carl Clutton and Selena Leung, Ministry of Housing, provided access to and help with the Ministry of Housing computer system.

We also wish to thank Lynda Hayward, Beverley Parr, Margaret Knott, Meri Stojkovic-Oliver, Tovia Pearl, Jennifer Oliphant and Kamla Krill from Social Data Research Limited, whose combined research and clerical expertise was crucial to the success of this study.

We are grateful to the housing authority managers, project managers and community relations workers in each of the housing authorities sampled in the study for their assistance and co-operation.

Thanks are also extended to the many service providers who took the time to fill out the agency questionnaires.

In addition, we wish to acknowledge the excellent fieldwork done by a team of over twenty interviewers across the province.

Finally, we are grateful to the family public housing tenants who kindly agreed to participate in this study.

FOREWORD

This report was prepared for the Ministry of Housing under the direction of a steering committee.

The survey received financial support from the Ministry of Housing, Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation and the Ministry of Community and Social Services and the Office of Senior Citizens' Affairs. Additional support was also provided by Ontario Housing Corporation, Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Limited and the Ministry of Health.

This report does not necessarily reflect the views of the Ministry of Housing, or any other agency represented on the steering committee. The responsibility for the collection of data and the accuracy of the analyses is that of the authors alone.

This document is intended to be a research report on the findings from the survey of family public housing tenants and the survey of agencies servicing the housing projects in which the tenants live.

No attempts have been made to "interpret the findings", nor to discuss the social policy implications of the findings. These important tasks are left to the social policy planners of related government ministries and other interested agencies or community services.

The survey of families in public housing is the first of its kind to be conducted among public housing tenants in Ontario. It indicates the extent to which family public housing respondents have difficulties with activities of daily living and what kinds of support tenants use -- whether informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal assistance from community services and agencies. The survey of agencies involves the opinions of the service providers regarding the needs of family public housing respondents.

It is our intent that the information gained from this survey will contribute to the development of appropriate policy in Ontario.

HIGHLIGHTS

The purpose of the study is to identify the extent to which families in public housing have difficulties with the activities of daily living and the kinds of supports they use -- informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal services from community agencies.

The study involved two separate surveys: the first was a face-to-face interview with 521 family public housing tenants; the second was a mailed survey to 137 service providers and agencies. Both surveys afforded higher than average response rates -- 83.2% and 72.8% respectively.

In total, 11 communities were selected for study, including Belleville, Etobicoke, London, North York, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines, Scarborough, Sudbury, Toronto and York.

A. Agency Survey Findings

According to service providers

- Most of the family housing projects are located in lower or middle income neighbourhoods with about one-third being situated in neighbourhoods with single family homes.

- Most projects were accessible either by walking or public transit to facilities such as the corner store, play areas for children, restaurants, a junior school, a drug store and parks. However, the majority of facilities listed were not within easy walking distance. Least accessible were facilities like "hospital emergency centres" and "community centres".

- Some families in public housing have no major problems, however, of those who do, the major concerns are lack of employment and skills, inadequate incomes, and no motivation to work.

- Almost all families in public housing have access to services such as the public health nurse, the police, Children's Aid, family benefit workers, educational upgrading and family counselling.

- As many as one-third to one-half of the service providers did not know or had no opinion about the availability of services such as other income maintenance and after school care.

- "Lack of information", "client unawareness", as well as the clients' "lack of recognition of their needs" and "lack of motivation" are the main reasons why families in public housing do not use the services they need.

- In the majority of cases, families in assisted housing do not use the services listed more than the community at large. The exceptions were "family benefits workers", "Children's Aid Society", "the police", and "housing project staff".

- Other family and neighbours were an important source of help, and in at least half of the cases were providing "a great deal" or "a fair amount" of help.

- In about half of the housing projects, service providers reported that they never met with the housing project staff regarding their service delivery and in many instances they did not know what the role of the housing project staff was.

- Over one-third of the respondents in the Agency survey said that they only hear about tenants' problems when a crisis arises and most felt than an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects would aid or improve service delivery.

Tenant Survey Findings

- Over two-thirds of the family respondents were Canadian born women, between the ages of 20 - 39. Very few of the respondents had completed high school, and seventy per cent of them were not employed outside the household.

- Incomes ranged from less than $500 per month to over $1200 per month, with over one-half of the respondents having incomes in the $500 - $799 range. The principal source of income was government income security payments such as family benefits or welfare. Two-thirds of the respondents indicated either regular or occasional difficulty finding enough money to buy food or pay the rent.

- Over two-thirds of the respondents headed single parent families. Three person households were most prevalent, followed by four person households. Two-thirds of the respondents had either one or two children.

- The majority of families have mainly school-aged children, with over one-half of the families with teenage children. Only seven per cent of families had children less than 5 years old.

- One-half of the respondents reported at least one health condition or disability in the family. Of those with health conditions, about 80% indicated that these health conditions interfered with daily activities.

- The average number of problems reported for all family members was 3.8. The most prevalent problems were with the budget, depression, tension or disagreement with family or friends, problems with health, and accidental injury to themselves or someone else. One-fifth of the respondents indicated their children were having trouble at school or work.

- The majority of family respondents had social contacts with children living elsewhere, other family, friends and neighbours. However, almost ten per cent of respondents reported that they had no one on whom they could depend in the local community.

- Almost ninety per cent of the family tenants interviewed had at least one difficulty with activities of daily living. The average number of difficulties reported with activities of daily living was 3.8.

- The number of respondents reporting difficulties were:

  70% of respondents reported difficulties managing the family budget and making ends meet.

  49% of respondents reported problems or crises for themselves or other adult family members.

  46% of respondents reported difficulties shopping for groceries.

  43% of respondents reported difficulties dealing with their child/children's emotional and behavioural problems.

  42% of respondents with children under 12 reported difficulties providing regular or occasional child care for their children.

  42% of respondents with children under 12 reported difficulties providing for recreation and other leisure activities for their children.

  34% of respondents reported difficulties with heavy cleaning.

  32% of respondents reported difficulties with child rearing and parenting generally.

  27% of respondents reported difficulties getting around the community on their own.

  25% of respondents reported difficulties getting information about government or community programs or services or any other help they might need.

- About forty per cent of respondents had assistance with grocery shopping and thirty per cent of respondents had received help for child care and adult personal problems within the past year. About one-quarter of family respondents received help with heavy cleaning and children's behavioural problems. Around one-fifth of respondents received assistance making ends meet and with transportation. And, fifteen per cent of those surveyed had help with providing recreation for their children, getting information and child rearing and parenting.

- Two-thirds of all support received was provided by informal sources (children living elsewhere, other family, friends or neighbours) and one-third was provided by formal sources (community agencies, hired services, church, club or organization).

- Arrangements for assistance tended to be made largely by the respondents themselves. Arrangements were sometimes made by physicians for adult personal problems and children's behavioural problems and problems with child rearing and parenting.

- Sources of support varied by the type of activity. Assistance with getting information, children's behavioural problems, and adult personal problems came mainly from formal sources of support. Assistance with heavy cleaning, grocery shopping, transportation and child care came mainly from informal sources. Help with making ends meet, child rearing and parenting came about equally from both informal and formal sources of assistance.

- Most respondents receiving assistance reported receiving both "enough help" and the "right kind of help". Activities in which a small group of respondents felt that the help they received was "not enough" included making ends meet, children's behavioural problems, child rearing and parenting or adult personal problems.

- The number of respondents who experienced difficulties and were not receiving assistance were:

28.9% of 239	respondents with difficulties grocery shopping
14.9% of 154	respondents with difficulties with child care
43.6% of 257	respondents with adult personal problems
41.8% of 177	respondents with difficulties with heavy cleaning
45.9% of 222	respondents with difficulties with children's behavioural problems
67.7% of 362	respondents with difficulties making ends meet
31.7% of 142	respondents with difficulties with transportation
50.0% of 152	respondents with difficulties providing recreation for children
44.5% of 128	respondents with difficulties getting information
56.3% of 167	respondents with difficulties child rearing and parenting.

- The receipt of assistance -- whether informal or formal -- was not related to the respondents' background characteristics such as age, birthplace, family type, the number and ages of the children in the home, level of education, employment status or total household monthly income or primary source of income.

- The receipt of formal and informal assistance with activities of daily living was related to the number of interfering health conditions and the number and type of tenant problems. The receipt of informal assistance was also related to the frequency of social contacts.

- The receipt of assistance with activities of daily living varied by municipality. Assistance from formal sources was greatest in London, Belleville and Owen Sound, and least in Sudbury. Assistance from informal sources was greatest in Owen Sound, Metropolitan Toronto and Belleville and least in Sudbury and Peterborough.

- The receipt of assistance with activities of daily living tends to be additive -- that is respondents who were receiving formal support were also more likely to be receiving informal support.

- Eighty-seven per cent of respondents and/or their family members used at least one community service or agency in the past year. On average, families made use of 2.8 services. The most frequently used services included family benefits workers, health services, other income maintenance programs, housing project staff including maintenance, educational upgrading programs, recreational community drop-in centres, job counselling, counselling on family law matters, pre-school child day care programs, and Children's Aid Society.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION AND RESEARCH DESIGN

1.1 Introduction and Purpose of this Survey

The purpose of this study is to identify the kinds of support services family public housing tenants use -- whether informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal services from community agencies.

This study came into focus as a direct spinoff from a study on support services for senior citizen public housing tenants which was being planned by the Ministry of Housing together with a number of other ministries or agencies. This latter study was intended to provide information on the current sources of support provided to senior citizens in public housing (see Ontario, Ministry of Housing, Patterns of Support: The Use of Support Services Among Senior Citizen Public Housing Tenants in Ontario, 1986). The decision was made to broaden the scope of the project to include a families component.

The decision to study sources of support to family public housing tenants was taken for two principal reasons. First, there is a growing concern about the problems faced by many families in public housing. Public housing in Ontario is assigned using a point system graded on the basis of greatest need. As such, the tenants tend to be those with many problems, including lack of adequate income, and/or single parent families mostly headed by women. The head of the household is typically unemployed, with very little education and few job skills.

Families receive their money mainly through family benefits or general welfare allowance. And, if the head of the household is employed, it is, on the average, at a very poorly paying job.

According to a recent report on the use of Family Support Services (Ministry of Community and Social Services), there appears to be an increasing level of dependance by family tenants on the community services available for their use. The necessary data does not presently exist to scientifically evaluate whether there is, or is not an increasing level of dependence by family tenants on community services. In fact very little data exists on the extent of assistance provided to family public housing tenants by community services.

Accordingly, this study was undertaken, in part, to identify the kinds of supports family public housing tenants use. Support may come from diverse sources, including both formal and informal sources. Informal support includes assistance by family members (i.e. parents, spouse, siblings, older children, etc.), friends and neighbours. Formal support includes assistance from income maintenance programs, including family benefits, and general welfare payments and community agencies such as physical and mental health services, day care programs, job counselling and educational upgrading programs to mention only a few. Any one, or combination of these sources of formal or informal support, may be used to meet the needs of the family.

This study is intended to provide some indications of the living situation of family public housing residents in Ontario. It concentrates specifically on the tenant groups experiencing difficulties with the activities of daily living and the use (or lack of use) of support services.

1.2 Study Design and Methodology

The study design consisted of two surveys. The first was a face-to-face, structured interview with 521 family public housing tenants and the second was a mailed survey to agencies servicing the housing projects in which the sampled tenants lived.

The tenant survey included questions on the use of and requirement for support from both informal and formal sources, health, demographic and personal characteristics (i.e. age, sex, household status, education, income), the problems tenants or their families have and information on the respondent's social network. The survey of support service agencies asked respondents about aspects of tenants' neighbourhoods, facilities available to the tenants, perceived problems of tenants in the project, support services available to tenants from community agencies, families and the role of the agency in the project and the community (see Appendix 5 for copies of the questionnaire).

The sampling method for the tenant survey employed a three stage random selection process: the selection of municipalities in which to sample, the selection of housing projects to be sampled within the municipalities, and the selection of family tenants within the selected housing projects. The sampling procedure is discussed in more detail in Appendix 3. The municipalities selected were Belleville, London, Metropolitan Toronto, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

The sample was drawn from the data files of Ontario Housing Corporation (OHC). In Metropolitan Toronto, OHC is only one of many suppliers of public housing. As such, the patterns of support for families in Toronto may not be an accurate reflection of the situation of all families in public housing in Metropolitan Toronto.

The response rate on the tenant survey was 83.2 per cent, with 8.8 per cent refusing to be interviewed and 8 per cent contacted but not interviewed. (For more detailed information, see Appendix 3, Table A.3.5 and Appendix 4, Table 1).

The various support service agencies were asked to complete a questionnaire for each of the housing projects in their municipality and/or jurisdiction and 72.8 per cent of the service providers responded (for more details on the methodology see Chapter 2 and Appendix 2).

CHAPTER 2 AGENCY SURVEY FINDINGS

2.0 Introduction

This section of the report presents the findings from the survey of support service providers from each of the six selected municipalities: Belleville, London, Metropolitan Toronto (excluding East York), Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

A number of objectives guided the formation of this study. They are:

1. To describe the neighbourhoods where housing projects are located.
2. To describe the service providers' perceptions of the tenants' problems.
3. To describe the service providers' perceptions of the services available to the tenants.
4. To describe why some tenants do not use the available services.
5. To describe the service providers' perceptions of their role in the housing projects.

2.1 Methodology

The survey was conducted through the mail and respondents were asked to complete a separate questionnaire relating to each of the housing projects sampled in their municipality or jurisdiction. The questionnaire addressed areas such as: neighbourhood location, quality of life and access, needs of people in the project, support services available to tenants from community agencies, and the role of the respondent's agency or service in the project and the area. (See Appendix 5 for a copy of the questionnaire).

An exhaustive list of agencies and organizations (see Appendix 2) was compiled from various community service directories. Included in this list were the community relations workers associated with the housing projects from which the tenants were sampled.

The survey was carried out in two phases. In the first phase, service providers from the compiled list were sent questionnaires[1]. In addition to answering questions about the projects and family tenants, respondents were asked to provide a list of those agencies, organizations and individuals which they felt were the main service providers to families in the sample housing projects. All of the names provided (see Appendix 2) were sent questionnaires in phase two.

---

[1] In the case of Metro Toronto where many services are decentralized, only community relations workers were initially surveyed.

In both phases, 173 service providers were contacted and a total of 604 questionnaires (one for each sampled housing project in their jurisdiction) was mailed. Almost three-quarters (72.8%) of the service providers responded, either by returning one or more completed questionnaires or by sending a letter explaining their role with the housing projects.

A total of 224 (37.1%) questionnaires was completed (see Appendix 2 for a detailed breakdown of response rates by municipality). Of this total, 137 questionnaires contained information about housing projects for families. About one-third of the questionnaires received were completed by Community Relations Workers (34.8%), followed by Public Health Nurses (17.4%). Other respondents included agency directors, program supervisors and co-ordinators and income maintenance officers (see Appendix 2, Table A.2.1 for a detailed description of the response pattern by service providers).

The number of services and the types of agencies varied by municipality. Consequently, the number and type of responses varied also. One should be cautioned that the results in this section are directly related to the existence in any given community of the various services. Readers should also note that the findings in this section are based on the professional opinions of the service providers who responded to the survey, and may not necessarily be representative of the service providers in the municipalities as a whole.

Respondents were asked to complete one questionnaire for each housing project they service, and therefore, the numbers presented in the tables in this chapter reflect the number of questionnaires or responses received and not the number of service providers who responded to the survey.

2.2 A Description of the Neighbourhood Where Housing Projects for Families are Located

The service providers were asked a number of questions concerning the neighbourhood in which each housing project was located. Although variations were found by municipality, housing projects were located most frequently in "a residential area with single family homes" (39.0%) (see Table 2.2.1). A "residential area that is mainly apartment or townhouses" was almost as common (30.9%). Just over ten per cent of the housing projects were in "an older residential area (12.5%) or "in commercial areas (11.0%). Thus, the majority (82.4%) of housing projects serviced by the responding agencies were situated in residential areas.

About one-third (33.6%) of the housing projects for families were located in neighbourhoods with mostly "families with young children (see Table 2.2.2). Most of the remaining family housing projects were in areas housing mainly "single parent families" (26.3%), "families with teenagers" (21.9%), or "older retired people" (10.2%). A few projects were in neighbourhoods with mainly ethnic, single or transient people.

When questioned about the socio-economic profile of the surrounding areas, service providers felt that the housing projects were located in either a "combination of middle to low income" neighbourhoods (46.0%) or "low income" areas (40.2%) (see Table 2.2.3). Variations did exist by municipality. In Belleville, St. Catharines, Owen Sound and Sudbury for example,

TABLE 2.2.1

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Neighbourhood Surrounding the Families Housing Project Percent of Responses by Predominant Type of Neighbourhood

Type of Neighbourhood	(N)	%
Mostly in a:		
Residential area with mainly single family homes	(53)	39.0
Residential area that is mainly apartments or townhouses	(42)	30.9
Older residential area	(17)	12.5
Commercial area	(15)	11.0
Semi-industrial area	(4)	2.6
Semi-rural area on the outskirts of town	(3)	2.2
Other	(2)	1.5
Total N	(136)	100.0

(Source: Question Q1)

TABLE 2.2.2

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Type of Residents in the Surrounding Neighbourhood
Percent of Responses by Predominant Type of Resident

	(N)	%
Mostly:		
Families with young children	(46)	33.6
Single parent families	(36)	26.3
Families with teenagers	(30)	21.9
Older retired people	(14)	10.2
Ethnic groups	(9)	6.6
Single people	(1)	0.7
Transient people	(1)	0.7
Other types of people	(0)	0.0
Total	(137)	100.0

(Source: Question Q2)

TABLE 2.2.3

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Socio-Economic Level of Households in the Families' Project Neighbourhood by Municipality

	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Combination of middle and low income	(63)	46.0	(2)	28.6	(10)	50.0	(28)	53.9	(4)	33.3	(6)	66.7	(5)	31.3	(8)	38.1
Mostly Low income	(55)	40.2	(5)	71.4	(8)	40.0	(19)	36.5	(6)	50.0	(0)	00.0	(6)	37.5	(11)	52.4
Mostly middle income	(19)	13.9	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.0	(5)	9.6	(2)	16.7	(3)	33.3	(5)	31.3	(2)	9.5

respondents indicated that the projects were located mainly in low income neighbourhoods. Respondents from Peterborough and Metro Toronto however, reported, more so than others, that the families projects were located in "mostly low and middle income" neighbourhoods.

The service providers were asked to rate a variety of aspects of the neighbourhood surrounding the housing project on a scale ranging from "excellent", "very good", "good", "fair" to "poor" (see Table 2.2.4). With the exception of public transit, respondents as a whole were not inclined to rate the neighbourhood characteristics highly (either "excellent" or "very good"). Aspects of safety such as "safety from crime against property", "safety from violence against people" and "safe to go out at night" were rated highly by less than twenty per cent of the respondents, although, in almost half (43.8%) of the projects, respondents rated the neighbourhood as being " safe to go out during the day" as "excellent" or "very good".

Respondents rated some characteristics of the neighbourhood highly for about one-quarter of the housing projects, namely "safe for children" (25.2%) and "parks and playgrounds" (25.0%), while others such as "local shopping nearby" and "schools" were rated as "excellent" or "very good" by 42.3 per cent and 41.5 per cent of respondents respectively

There are some municipality differences with respect to these ratings. In Sudbury, on the one hand, none of the

TABLE 2.2.4

Support Service Providers' Ratings of Selected Neighbourhood Attributes
(Per Cent of Responses Indicating Very Good or Excellent by Municipality)

			Municipality													
Neighbourhood Attribute	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Safety from crime against property	(10)	7.4	(1)	14.3	(1)	5.0	(3)	5.9	(2)	16.7	(2)	22.2	(1)	6.3	(0)	0.0
Safety from violence against people	(22)	16.1	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.0	(8)	15.4	(3)	25.0	(3)	55.6	(4)	25.0	(0)	0.0
Safe to go out at night	(22)	16.1	(1)	14.3	(0)	0.0	(8)	15.4	(2)	16.7	(6)	66.7	(5)	31.3	(0)	0.0
Community service	(28)	20.6	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.0	(16)	31.4	(0)	0.0	(4)	44.4	(4)	25.0	(2)	9.5
Amount of noise from traffic, etc.	(28)	20.6	(1)	14.3	(3)	16.7	(9)	17.6	(4)	33.3	(2)	22.2	(4)	25.0	(5)	25.0
Recreation and other facilities	(30)	22.1	(0)	0.0	(4)	20.0	(17)	32.7	(0)	0.0	(4)	44.4	(3)	20.0	(2)	9.5
Quality of air	(31)	22.6	(3)	42.9	(5)	25.0	(8)	15.4	(5)	41.7	(4)	44.4	(5)	31.3	(1)	4.8
Condition of housing	(31)	22.6	(0)	0.0	(5)	25.0	(11)	21.2	(4)	33.3	(5)	55.6	(4)	25.0	(2)	10.0
Church or synagogue	(32)	23.4	(1)	14.3	(4)	20.0	(13)	25.0	(1)	8.3	(4)	44.4	(3)	18.8	(6)	28.6
Parks and playgrounds nearby	(34)	25.0	(1)	14.3	(3)	15.0	(17)	32.7	(1)	9.1	(6)	66.7	(4)	25.0	(2)	9.5
Safe for children	(34)	25.0	(2)	28.6	(3)	42.9	(15)	29.4	(4)	33.3	(5)	55.5	(4)	25.0	(1)	4.8
Schools	(56)	41.5	(2)	28.6	(8)	42.1	(28)	53.8	(2)	16.7	(6)	66.7	(4)	26.7	(6)	28.6
Local shopping nearby	(58)	42.3	(1)	14.3	(8)	40.0	(22)	42.3	(6)	50.0	(5)	55.6	(7)	43.8	(9)	42.9
Safe to go out during day	(60)	43.8	(3)	42.9	(8)	40.0	(26)	50.0	(5)	41.7	(6)	66.6	(7)	43.8	(5)	23.8
Public transit	(73)	53.3	(2)	28.6	(9)	45.0	(31)	59.6	(5)	41.7	(8)	88.9	(5)	31.3	(13)	61.9

(Source: Question 4)

respondents gave the housing projects high ratings for aspects such as "saftey from crime against property", safe to go out at night", and "safety from violence against people". Peterborough, on the other hand, seems to fare better than the other municipalities on most items, particularly with respect to amenities or characteristics such as "public transit", "schools", "parks and playgrounds nearby", "local shopping nearby", "safe to go out at night", "safe for children", "condition of housing" and "safe from violence".

Accessibility to facilities in the neighbourhood was addressed by a number of questions. According to the service providers, almost all projects (91.0%) were accessible to public transit, and in almost all cases (88.3%) transit service was available on a frequent basis. About six per cent (6.3%) of the service providers' responses indicated that it was fairly or very difficult for tenants to get around the neighbourhood.

Responses to questions of accessibility to specific facilities are given in Table 2.2.5. The majority of tenants are within easy walking distance of the "corner store" (83.2%), "play areas for older children" (67.2%), a restaurant or coffee shop" (64.2%), a "junior school" (64.2%), "playgrounds for young children" (62.8%), a "drugstore" (61.3%), and "parks" (59.9%). Just over half of the tenants are within easy walking distance of a "shopping centre" (54.0%), a "bank" (53.3%), and a "doctor's office" (51.1%). Least accessible to family tenants

TABLE 2.2.5

Suppport Service Providers' Perceptions of the Location of Facilities in the Neighbourhood Surrounding the Families' Housing Project by Municipality
(Per Cent of Responses Indicating Within Easy Walking Distance)

Facilities	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Corner store	(114)	83.2	(3)	42.9	(19)	95.0	(46)	90.2	(9)	75.0	(7)	77.8	(14)	93.3	(16)	76.2
Play areas for children age 5-12	(92)	67.2	(2)	28.6	(15)	75.0	(37)	72.5	(3)	25.0	(8)	88.9	(14)	93.3	(13)	61.9
Restaurant/coffee shop	(88)	64.2	(2)	28.6	(12)	60.0	(36)	70.6	(7)	58.3	(4)	44.4	(11)	73.3	(16)	76.2
Junior school	(88)	64.2	(3)	42.9	(14)	70.0	(37)	72.5	(5)	41.7	(3)	33.3	(12)	80.0	(14)	66.7
Playgrounds for young children	(86)	62.8	(1)	14.3	(15)	75.0	(38)	74.5	(2)	16.7	(6)	66.7	(10)	66.7	(14)	66.7
Drug store	(84)	61.3	(2)	28.6	(11)	55.0	(37)	72.5	(7)	58.3	(3)	33.3	(11)	73.3	(13)	61.9
Parks	(82)	59.9	(2)	28.6	(15)	75.0	(34)	66.7	(2)	16.7	(9)	100.0	(10)	66.7	(10)	47.6
Shopping centre	(74)	54.0	(1)	14.3	(10)	50.0	(30)	58.8	(7)	58.3	(4)	44.4	(10)	66.7	(12)	57.1
Bank	(73)	53.3	(1)	14.3	(10)	50.0	(35)	68.6	(1)	8.3	(2)	22.2	(9)	60.0	(15)	71.4
Doctor's office	(70)	51.1	(1)	14.3	(10)	50.0	(36)	70.6	(9)	75.0	(2)	22.2	(6)	40.0	(6)	28.6
Tavern/bar	(65)	47.5	(0)	0.0	(7)	35.0	(32)	62.7	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(10)	66.7	(15)	71.4
Church/synagogue	(60)	43.8	(2)	28.6	(11)	55.0	(20)	39.2	(2)	16.7	(3)	33.3	(8)	53.3	(14)	66.7
High schools	(59)	43.1	(3)	42.9	(8)	40.0	(21)	41.2	(7)	58.3	(3)	33.3	(8)	53.3	(9)	42.9
Baseball parks, football, hockey, etc.	(57)	41.6	(2)	28.6	(12)	60.0	(25)	49.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	44.4	(6)	40.0	(8)	38.1

TABLE 2.2.5 (con't)

Suppport Service Providers' Perceptions of the Location of Facilities in the Neighbourhood Surrounding the Families' Housing Project by Municipality
(Per Cent of Responses Indicating Within Easy Walking Distance)

Facilities	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Post office	(55)	40.2	(2)	28.6	(8)	40.0	(30)	58.8	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(2)	13.3	(11)	52.4
Pools	(43)	31.4	(0)	0.0	(8)	40.0	(26)	51.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(5)	33.3	(2)	9.5
Preschool child care	(42)	30.7	(1)	14.3	(12)	60.0	(23)	45.1	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(3)	20.0	(3)	14.3
Summer only programs	(42)	30.7	(2)	28.6	(6)	30.0	(23)	45.1	(2)	16.7	(2)	22.2	(3)	20.0	(4)	19.0
Medical clinics	(39)	28.7	(0)	0.0	(4)	20.0	(17)	33.3	(9)	75.0	(1)	11.1	(3)	20.0	(5)	23.8
Library	(27)	19.7	(2)	28.6	(4)	20.0	(13)	25.5	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	6.7	(7)	33.3
Arenas	(25)	18.3	(0)	0.0	(6)	30.0	(9)	17.6	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	26.7	(6)	28.6
School age child care	(25)	18.3	(1)	14.3	(4)	20.0	(17)	33.3	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(1)	6.7	(1)	4.8
Commercial, recreation facilities	(22)	16.1	(1)	14.3	(2)	10.0	(8)	15.7	(2)	16.7	(0)	0.0	(1)	6.7	(8)	38.1
Community centres	(21)	15.3	(2)	28.6	(2)	10.0	(12)	23.5	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(5)	23.8
Hospital emergency	(14)	10.2	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.0	(3)	5.9	(8)	66.7	(0)	0.0	(1)	6.7	(0)	0.0

(Source: Question Q6)

in terms of walking distance was the "hospital emergency" (10.2%) and the community centres" (15.3%).

Accessibility does vary somewhat by community. (see Table 2.2.5) For example, compared to the total, housing projects located in Metro Toronto are more likely to be within easy walking distance to a number of facilities such as the corner store, playgrounds, a restaurant, a bank, shopping, a post office, pools, sports fields, medical clinics, and libraries.

2.3 Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Tenant Problems

The service providers were asked to report the seriousness of a number of tenant problems that might be experienced by the famlies in the housing projects in this study. These problems are listed in Table 2.3.1, as well as the percentage of responses given by agencies who rated each specific problem as "very" or "fairly serious". According to service providers, the most serious problems for the family tenants as a whole, are employment related including "lack of employment" for parents (71.8%) and youth (71.8%), "lack of employment skills" (67.6%), "inadequate incomes" (62.0%) and "no motivation to work" (54.2%). These problems appear to be fairly serious in almost all municipalities, the only exception being Sudbury where parental unemployment is not rated as serious (27.3%, N = 21). "Inabiblity to manage money" and "lack of parenting skills" are also perceived as fairly serious by a number of the agency respondents (50.7% and 45.1% respectively).

For the most part, agencies in the various municipalities were quite consistent in their assessments of the problems rated as most serious in the questionnaire. In a number of instances, however, respondents from Peterborough did not feel the problems in their jurisdiction were as great as those from any of the other communities. This was particularly the case for problems such as "inability to manage money", "lack of parenting skills", "problems controlling children", "delinquency with children", "problems dealing with crises" and "failure to recognize needs".

TABLE 2.3.1

Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Tenant Problems
(Per Cent of Responses Indicating Very Serious or Serious Tenant Problems by Municipality)

Problem	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Lack of employment (parents)	(102)	71.8	(3)	42.9	(16)	66.7	(38)	74.5	(8)	72.2	(6)	66.7	(10)	71.4	(21)	27.3
Lack of employment (youth)	(102)	71.8	(3)	42.9	(16)	66.7	(36)	70.6	(10)	90.9	(7)	77.8	(11)	78.6	(19)	86.4
Lack of employment skills	(96)	67.6	(3)	42.9	(17)	70.8	(36)	70.6	(8)	72.7	(5)	55.6	(9)	64.3	(20)	90.9
Inadequate incomes	(88)	62.0	(2)	28.6	(15)	62.5	(34)	66.7	(4)	36.4	(6)	66.7	(11)	78.6	(16)	72.7
No motivation to work	(77)	54.2	(4)	57.1	(11)	45.8	(30)	58.8	(9)	81.8	(3)	33.3	(7)	50.0	(13)	59.1
Inability to manage money	(72)	50.7	(3)	42.9	(15)	62.5	(27)	52.9	(8)	72.7	(0)	0.0	(11)	78.6	(8)	36.4
Lack of parenting skills	(64)	45.1	(3)	42.9	(11)	45.8	(25)	49.0	(4)	36.4	(3)	33.3	(8)	57.1	(10)	45.5
Problems controlling children	(58)	40.8	(3)	42.9	(9)	37.5	(24)	47.1	(6)	54.5	(2)	22.2	(7)	50.0	(7)	31.8
Delinquency of children	(56)	39.4	(3)	42.9	(10)	41.7	(21)	41.2	(4)	36.4	(2)	22.2	(6)	42.9	(10)	45.5
Problems dealing with crises	(54)	38.0	(3)	42.9	(12)	50.0	(21)	41.2	(5)	45.5	(2)	22.2	(4)	28.6	(7)	31.8
Failure to recognize needs	(46)	32.4	(3)	42.9	(7)	29.2	(18)	35.3	(5)	45.5	(2)	22.2	(5)	35.7	(6)	27.3
No information about adult programs	(42)	29.6	(2)	28.6	(7)	29.2	(17)	33.3	(1)	9.1	(2)	22.2	(3)	21.4	(10)	45.5
Abuse of alcohol	(39)	27.5	(1)	14.3	(10)	41.7	(15)	29.4	(2)	18.2	(2)	22.2	(5)	35.7	(4)	18.2
Children's school work	(39)	27.5	(2)	28.6	(8)	33.3	(14)	27.5	(6)	54.5	(2)	22.2	(4)	28.6	(3)	13.6

TABLE 2.3.1 (con't)

Support Service Providers' Rating of Selected Tenant Problems
(Per Cent of Responses Indicating Very Serious or Serious Tenant Problems by Municipality)

Problem	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Problems getting along	(39)	27.5	(2)	28.6	(7)	29.2	(15)	29.4	(5)	45.5	(1)	11.1	(4)	28.6	(5)	22.7
Problems with agencies	(38)	26.8	(2)	28.6	(7)	29.2	(15)	29.4	(3)	27.3	(0)	0.0	(4)	28.6	(4)	18.2
Getting adequate meals	(36)	25.4	(0)	0.0	(6)	25.0	(14)	27.5	(2)	18.2	(2)	22.2	(5)	35.7	(7)	31.8
Being isolated	(33)	23.2	(2)	28.6	(11)	45.8	(11)	21.6	(0)	0.0	(3)	33.3	(3)	21.4	(3)	13.6
Family violence	(32)	22.5	(2)	28.6	(7)	29.2	(11)	21.6	(4)	36.4	(0)	0.0	(4)	28.6	(4)	18.2
Abuse of drugs	(26)	18.3	(1)	14.3	(4)	16.7	(11)	21.6	(2)	18.2	(2)	22.2	(1)	7.1	(5)	22.7
Housekeeping	(25)	17.6	(1)	14.3	(5)	20.8	(4)	7.8	(2)	18.2	(3)	33.3	(5)	35.7	(5)	22.7
Transportation	(20)	14.1	(1)	14.3	(5)	20.8	(4)	7.8	(1)	9.1	(2)	22.2	(2)	14.3	(7)	31.8
Poor physical health	(16)	11.3	(1)	14.3	(3)	12.5	(8)	15.7	(1)	9.1	(1)	11.1	(0)	0.0	(2)	9.1

(Source: Question Q9)

2.4 Support Services Available to Family Tenants from Community Agencies

One of the key issues addressed in the survey was the availability of support services to public housing tenants. The service providers were asked to evaluate a list of 25 services in terms of their availability to family tenants (see Table 2.4.1). One way of assessing the results in this table is to look first at the proportion of responses given by agencies who say that the particular service is available to family tenants. This proportion varies considerably among the services, however, there was a general consensus that almost all tenants have access to a

"health services" (89.6%), "the police" (88.8%), "Children's Aid" (86.7%), "family benefits workers" (83.9%), "educational upgrading" (80.7%), and "family counselling" (80.3%).Most of the other services were available to a majority of tenants, however, there were two services that, according to the respondents, were available to about half of the family projects in the sample -- "after school child care" (48.5%), and "recreational community centres" (55.7%).

Table 2.4.1 can also be seen as a reflection of the differences in awareness of the respondents about the existence of services other than the one they offer. The proportion of respondents who say that they "don't know" or didn't respond when asked about a particular service ranged from about ten per cent for "health services" (10.4%) or the "police" (10.5%), to over one third (35.0%) for "other income maintenance". In about one-

TABLE 2.4.1

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Supports Available to Family Tenants

Services	Available		Not Available		Don't Know No Opinion	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	
Health Services	(124)	89.6	(0)	0.0	(13)	10
Police	(123)	88.8	(1)	0.7	(13)	10
Children's Aid	(120)	86.7	(0)	0.0	(17)	13
Family Benefits Workers	(116)	83.9	(0)	0.0	(21)	16
Educational Upgrading	(110)	80.7	(2)	1.4	(25)	17
Family Counselling	(111)	80.3	(4)	2.9	(22)	16
Mental Health (children)	(105)	77.1	(2)	1.4	(30)	21
Big Brothers/Sisters	(106)	76.6	(3)	2.2	(28)	21
Mental Health (adult)	(106)	76.6	(4)	2.9	(27)	20
Homemaker	(103)	74.6	(6)	4.3	(28)	21
Preschool Child Care	(103)	74.6	(6)	4.3	(28)	21
Alcohol & Drug Counselling	(103)	74.6	(7)	5.0	(27)	20
Counselling for Family Law Matters	(102)	73.8	(4)	2.9	(31)	23
Job Counselling	(102)	73.8	(7)	5.0	(28)	21
Housing Project Staff*	(101)	73.1	(4)	2.9	(32)	24
Community Information	(101)	73.1	(8)	5.8	(28)	20
Parenting Education	(100)	72.3	(4)	2.9	(33)	24
Budget Counselling	(100)	72.3	(12)	8.6	(25)	19
Family Planning	(99)	71.6	(1)	0.7	(37)	27
School Social Workers	(93)	67.2	(15)	10.8	(16)	12

TABLE 2.4.1 (con't)

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Supports Available to Family Tenants

Services	Available		Not Available		Don't Know No Opinion	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	
Nutrition Counselling	(93)	67.2	(10)	7.2	(34)	25
Other Income Maintenance	(88)	63.6	(2)	1.4	(47)	35
Recreational/Community Centres	(77)	55.7	(26)	18.7	(34)	25
After School Child Care	(67)	48.5	(30)	21.6	(40)	29

* includes maintenance staff

(Source: Question Q17a)

quarter to one-third of the housing projects, respondents didn't know or didn't have an opinion about the availability of other services to family housing tenants in their community.

In some instances there was quite a range in responses among the municipalities in terms of how well needs were being met. (see Table 2.4.2) "Family benefits workers", for example, were seen as meeting most needs in over three quarters (76.2%, N = 16) of the housing projects in Sudbury and only 12.5%, (N = 1), of the projects in Belleville, 27.3%, (N = 3) of the projects in Owen Sound, 33.3%, (N = 3) of the projects in Peterborough, 47.4%, (N = 9) of the projects in London, 58.3% (N = 7) of the projects in St. Catherines and 60.0% (N = 30) in Metro Toronto. Similar intermunicipality differences can be noted for many of the remaining services.

When asked why services were meeting few needs or were not available, tenant unawareness was given as a reason in many instances, as well as the cost, the stigma attached to seeking help, and other causes. There were not enough responses in some of the categories in this question to do further breakdowns.

TABLE 2.4.2

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Support Services Available to Families by Municipality
(Responses Reporting that Service Meets Most Needs of Recipients)

Type of Support Service	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Health	(92)	66.0	(2)	25.0	(15)	78.9	(38)	76.0	(5)	45.5	(6)	66.7	(11)	84.6	(15)	71.4
Police	(88)	63.3	(3)	37.5	(12)	63.2	(35)	70.0	(6)	54.5	(7)	77.8	(9)	69.2	(16)	76.2
Children's Aid	(74)	53.2	(2)	25.0	(12)	63.2	(30)	60.0	(5)	45.5	(5)	55.6	(7)	58.3	(13)	61.9
Family Benefits Worker	(69)	49.6	(1)	12.5	(9)	47.4	(30)	60.0	(3)	27.3	(3)	33.3	(7)	58.3	(16)	76.2
Housing Project Staff*	(60)	43.2	(2)	25.0	(9)	47.4	(29)	58.0	(3)	27.3	(3)	33.3	(6)	46.2	(8)	38.1
Other Income Maintenance	(49)	35.3	(0)	0.0	(7)	36.8	(26)	52.0	(2)	18.2	(2)	22.2	(2)	15.4	(11)	52.4
Community Information	(45)	32.4	(1)	12.5	(7)	36.8	(23)	46.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	44.4	(6)	46.2	(4)	19.1
Mental Health (adult)	(41)	29.5	(1)	12.5	(8)	42.1	(19)	38.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(4)	30.8	(8)	38.1
Family Planning	(38)	27.3	(2)	25.0	(6)	31.6	(17)	34.0	(2)	18.2	(4)	44.4	(0)	0.0	(7)	33.3
Family Counselling	(37)	26.6	(0)	0.0	(5)	26.3	(20)	40.0	(0)	0.0	(5)	55.6	(3)	23.1	(4)	19.1
School Social Workers	(36)	25.9	(0)	0.0	(6)	31.6	(23)	46.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	15.4	(5)	23.8
Homemaking	(36)	25.9	(0)	0.0	(5)	26.3	(16)	32.0	(0)	0.0	(3)	33.3	(3)	23.1	(9)	42.9
Counselling on Family Law Matters	(35)	25.2	(1)	12.5	(4)	21.1	(17)	34.0	(2)	18.2	(1)	11.1	(3)	23.1	(7)	33.3
Preschool Child Care	(31)	22.3	(1)	12.5	(6)	31.6	(18)	36.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(1)	7.7	(4)	19.1
Mental Health (children)	(30)	22.6	(1)	12.5	(5)	26.3	(17)	34.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	11.1	(2)	15.4	(4)	19.1

TABLE 2.4.2 (con't)

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Support Services Available to Families by Municipality
(Responses Reporting that Service Meets Most Needs of Recipients)

Type of Support Service	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Educational Upgrading	(29)	20.9	(1)	12.5	(5)	26.3	(14)	28.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(7)	33.3
Parenting Education	(29)	20.9	(1)	12.5	(5)	26.3	(15)	30.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(6)	28.6
Nutrition Counselling	(28)	20.1	(0)	0.0	(3)	15.8	(10)	20.0	(2)	18.2	(3)	33.3	(3)	23.1	(7)	33.3
Alcohol & Drug Counselling	(27)	19.4	(1)	12.5	(4)	21.1	(11)	22.0	(2)	18.2	(2)	22.2	(2)	15.4	(5)	23.8
Budget Counselling	(26)	18.7	(1)	12.5	(3)	15.8	(13)	26.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	44.4	(0)	0.0	(5)	23.8
Big Sisters/Brothers	(26)	18.7	(1)	12.5	(4)	21.1	(10)	20.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(3)	23.1	(6)	28.6
Job Counselling	(25)	18.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	21.1	(14)	28.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(5)	23.8
Recreational/Community Centres	(25)	18.0	(0)	0.0	(4)	21.1	(18)	36.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(3)	14.3
After School Child Care	(16)	11.5	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.5	(12)	24.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	9.5

* includes building maintenance

(Source: Question Q17)

TABLE 2.4.3

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Use of Services by Family Tenants as Compared to the Community in General

Type of Service	Use of Services by Family Tenants as Compared to Community							
	Used More		Used Same		Used Less		Don't Know/ No Opinion	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Family Benefits Workers	(99)	65.7	(16)	11.7	(3)	2.2	(7)	5.2
Children's Aid Society	(84)	61.3	(25)	18.2	(2)	1.5	(26)	19.0
Police	(83)	60.6	(26)	19.0	(7)	5.1	(21)	15.3
Housing Project Staff*	(79)	57.7	(19)	13.9	(6)	4.4	(33)	24.1
Other Income Maintenance	(63)	46.0	(33)	24.1	(7)	5.1	(34)	24.8
Big Brothers/Sisters	(54)	39.4	(42)	30.7	(13)	9.5	(28)	20.4
School Social Workers	(48)	35.0	(43)	31.4	(10)	7.3	(36)	26.3
Educational Upgrading	(51)	37.2	(30)	21.9	(27)	19.7	(29)	21.2
Health	(50)	36.5	(56)	40.9	(7)	5.1	(24)	17.5
Community Information Referral	(48)	35.0	(40)	29.2	(20)	14.6	(29)	21.2
Mental Health (adult)	(45)	32.8	(48)	35.0	(14)	10.2	(30)	21.9
Mental Health (children)	(43)	31.4	(51)	37.2	(11)	8.0	(32)	23.4
Counselling on Family Law	(43)	31.4	(44)	32.1	(19)	13.9	(31)	22.6
Job Counselling	(37)	27.0	(33)	24.1	(34)	24.8	(33)	24.1
Family Counselling	(32)	23.4	(43)	31.4	(30)	21.9	(32)	23.4
Homemaker	(30)	21.9	(54)	39.4	(24)	17.5	(29)	21.2
Recreational/Community Centres	(25)	18.2	(44)	32.1	(29)	21.2	(39)	28.5
Alcohol & Drug Counselling	(24)	17.5	(53)	38.7	(27)	19.7	(33)	24.1
Preschool Child Day Care	(23)	16.8	(43)	31.4	(42)	30.6	(29)	21.2
Before and After School Child Care	(21)	15.3	(38)	27.7	(39)	28.5	(39)	28.5

TABLE 2.4.3 (con't)

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Use of Services by Family Tenants as Compared to the Community in General

Type of Service	Use of Services by Family Tenants as Compared to Community							
	Used More		Used Same		Used Less		Don't Know/ No Opinion	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Credit/Budget Counselling	(22)	16.1	(49)	35.8	(35)	25.5	(31)	22.6
Parenting Education	(21)	15.3	(39)	28.5	(46)	33.6	(31)	22.6
Family Planning	(12)	8.8	(48)	35.0	(40)	29.2	(37)	27.0
Nutrition Counselling	(11)	8.0	(56)	40.9	(38)	27.7	(32)	23.4

* includes building maintenance

(Source: Question Q18)

Service providers had a diversity of opinions about the use of services by families in assisted housing compared to the community in general (see Table 2.4.3).

In the majority of cases, service providers did not feel that families in assisted housing used the services listed more than families in the community at large. The exceptions were: "family benefits worker" (65.7%), "Children's Aid Society" (61.3%), "the police" (60.6%) and "the housing project staff" (57.7%).

Service providers were offered a list of reasons why some public housing tenants do not use the services they may need. (see Table 2.4.4) Of this list, most respondents indicated that "lack of motivation", "lack of information" and "lack of recognition of needs" on the part of the tenants themselves, were the main factors.

TABLE 2.4.4

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of the Reasons Why Family Tenants Do Not Use the Services They Need (Per Cent of Agency Responses that Ranked Each of the Following as Number One*)

Reason	Total	
	(N)	%
Lack of motivation	(30)	18.2
Lack of information	(29)	17.6
Tenants can't be bothered	(28)	17.0
Lack of recognition of needs	(27)	16.4
Tenants deny they have needs	(15)	9.1
Stigma attached to seeking help	(13)	7.9
Inability to approach agencies	(8)	4.8
Services are too far away	(6)	3.6
Services are too expensive	(5)	3.0
Tenants are too independant to ask	(4)	2.4
Language difficulty	(4)	2.4
Total	(165)	100.0

* Note that in some instances more than one reason was given. This is reflected in the totals.

(Source: Question 20)

2.5 The Role of Agencies

The questionnaire to service providers included a number of items pertaining to their role in public Housing, their opinions about the role of the public housing staff, and some of the problems that service providers face. Many of these questions were open-ended. A brief overview of some of the responses is given here.

Respondents were asked whether or not the housing project staff help family tenants decide on their needs for services. In almost half of the cases, the answer was "didn't know" (50.8%). About forty per cent (39.1) said "yes" and the remaining ten per cent of the responses (10.2%) indicated "no".

A subsequent question was asked concerning how much the housing project staff help tenants obtain the available services. About fifteen per cent (14.7%) of the responses reflected a feeling that project staff helped "a great deal", while almost one quarter said "a fair amount" (24.0%), less than one fifth of the responses indicated "somewhat" (18.6%), and less than five per cent (4.7%) of the responses "not at all". The most frequently given response was "didn't know" (38.0%).

Another question to agencies concerning the role of the housing project staff was whether or not the staff of the housing project could do more to help tenants in families' housing projects get the service they need. In almost half (45.0%) of the housing projects, the respondents felt that housing project staff could, in another nine per cent (9.2%) they thought obtaining services was the individual tenant's responsibility, and in about eight per cent of the projects (8.3%), the respondents were of the opinion that obtaining services was the agencies' responsibility. In exactly one-quarter (25%), of the family housing projects, respondents felt that the housing project staff provided sufficient help, and in just over twelve per cent (12.5%), they didn't know what the role of housing project staff should be.

None of the service providers felt families should help more than they were already helping. In fact about half felt other family (46.0%) and neighbours (46.7%) were providing a great deal or at least a fair amount of help to tenants with problems and needs.

A number of questions in the survey concerned some of the problems that service providers face in their work with family tenants in public housing. When respondents were asked whether they felt they were able to learn about tenant problems soon enough to take the appropriate action, 36.1% of the responses reflected the opinion by agencies that they only hear about problems when a crisis arises. In about one-quarter (26.2%) of the projects, respondents claimed that they found out about such problems quite soon, and in just under one-third (29.5%) of the projects, respondents reported only sometimes finding out about problems right away.

Respondents felt that an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects would aid or improve service delivery in most (69.3%) of the family projects, although in about twenty per cent (19.7%) of the cases, respondents said they didn't know if this type of facility would be advantageous. When asked whether or not there was a neighbourhood planning mechanism available in the area where the housing project was located, almost one-half (46.5%) of the respondents didn't know. Of those who said a planning mechanism did exist (23.6%, N = 30), most said it was somewhat or very effective (74.2%, N = 23).

A question that dealt with problems faced by service providers asked how frequently a number of specifically listed problems presented major obstacles in their work or the work of their agency. The list of problems and the overall responses given are presented in Table 2.5.1. The problem that occurred most often, according to the agencies, was "lack of client motivation" (56.1% reporting that this occurs often). This was followed by "lack of client confidence" (27.9%), and "client unawareness" (27.3%).

Table 2.5.2 presents the per cent of agency responses reporting that these problems occur "often", broken down by municipality. "Lack of client motivation", for example, was not considered a problem in Belleville, however, it was perceived as

TABLE 2.5.1

The Frequency With Which Respondents Encountered Various Obstacles to Support Delivery

Obstacle	Frequency							
	Often		Sometimes		Rarely		Never	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Lack of client motivation	(64)	51.6	(53)	42.7	(5)	4.0	(1)	0.8
Client unawareness	(33)	27.3	(66)	54.6	(18)	14.9	(3)	2.5
Lack of client confidence	(32)	26.2	(62)	50.8	(22)	18.0	(5)	4.1
Long waiting lists for referrals	(27)	22.1	(56)	45.9	(29)	23.8	(9)	7.4
Clients see services as undesirable	(26)	21.1	(58)	47.2	(35)	28.5	(3)	2.4
Stigma attached	(23)	16.8	(73)	53.3	(27)	19.7	(1)	0.7
Lack of co-ordination between community services	(20)	16.4	(60)	49.2	(36)	29.5	(4)	3.3
Clients see services as admission of helplessness	(19)	15.5	(69)	56.1	(30)	24.4	(4)	3.3
Lack of clarity of roles	(12)	9.8	(54)	43.9	(44)	35.8	(12)	9.8
Inadequacies in the assessment process	(11)	9.3	(58)	49.2	(46)	39.0	(2)	1.7

(Source: Question Q31)

TABLE 2.5.2

Support Service Providers' Perceptions of Obstacles to the Delivery of Supports
(Responses Indicating Obstacles Encountered Often by Municipality)

Obstacle	Municipality															
	Total		Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Lack of client motivation	(64)	51.6	(0)	0.0	(11)	61.1	(29)	56.9	(5)	50.0	(2)	28.6	(5)	38.5	(12)	60.0
Client unawareness	(33)	27.3	(1)	25.0	(6)	33.3	(22)	44.0	(0)	0.0	(1)	14.3	(0)	0.0	(3)	15.8
Lack of client confidence	(32)	27.3	(1)	25.0	(9)	52.9	(13)	25.5	(1)	10.0	(2)	28.6	(2)	15.4	(4)	20.0
Long waiting lists for referrals	(27)	22.1	(1)	20.0	(7)	36.8	(10)	19.6	(4)	40.0	(2)	28.6	(3)	23.1	(0)	0.0
Clients see services as undesirable	(26)	21.1	(0)	0.0	(6)	31.6	(11)	22.0	(2)	22.2	(2)	28.6	(1)	7.7	(4)	20.0
Stigma attached	(23)	16.8	(1)	14.3	(1)	5.0	(11)	21.2	(2)	16.7	(2)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(6)	28.6
Lack of co-ordination between community services	(20)	16.4	(0)	0.0	(3)	15.8	(9)	17.7	(2)	22.2	(0)	0.0	(6)	46.2	(0)	0.0
Clients see services as admission of helplessness	(19)	15.5	(1)	20.0	(3)	17.7	(9)	17.7	(2)	20.0	(2)	28.6	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.0
Lack of clarity of roles	(12)	9.8	(0)	0.0	(2)	10.5	(5)	10.0	(2)	20.0	(0)	0.0	(2)	15.4	(1)	5.3
Inadequacies in the assessment process	(11)	9.3	(0)	0.0	(1)	5.9	(5)	10.4	(2)	20.0	(2)	28.6	(0)	0.0	(1)	5.3

* Inconsistency in some per cents due to different number of municipality responses to each problem.

(Source: Question Q31)

a problem more often in London (61.1%, N = 11), Sudbury (60.0%, N = 12) and Metro Toronto (56.9, N = 29).

A few questions in the survey concerned the specific roles that the various agencies had in the families' housing projects and the surrounding community. Respondents were asked how often they were in the project for purposes of service delivery. Their responses varied by the type of service offered. For the purpose of this analysis the results are discussed for the agencies overall. Almost one third (33.1%) of the projects were visited by service providers at least once a week, if not more.

In half of the projects (49.6%), the service providers indicated they "never" met with housing project staff regarding their service delivery, and in more than one third (38.0%) of the projects they met with staff "less than once a month". When asked how often they engage in case conferring with other service providers, most responses indicated "less than once a month" (43.0%), or "never" (12.4%).

In just over half (53.2) of the housing projects, service providers indicated that their agency did not provide more intense service in that particular housing project than in the community as a whole. And in most (62.6%) of the projects, there were no other agencies in the area providing the same sort of services.

As a final question, service providers were asked to anticipate any significant changes in the degrees of independence among the family residents in the projects over the next five years. More than half (54.7%) of the responses reflected the opinion by respondents that things would remain the same, almost one quarter (24.8%) expected residents to become less independent, and in only eight per cent of the projects did service providers feel that tenants would become more independent.

CHAPTER 3 TENANT SURVEY FINDINGS

3.0 Introduction

This chapter of the report presents the findings for the survey of family public housing tenants. A number of objectives guided the formation of the study. They were:

1. To describe family public housing tenants with respect to their background characteristics, health status, tenant problems and social networks.
2. To describe the difficulties with the activities of daily living reported by family public housing tenants.
3. To describe the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by family public housing tenants with the activities of daily living.
4. To describe the sources of assistance used by family public housing tenants with the activities of daily living.
5. To describe the factors which relate to the receipt of informal and formal sources of assistance.
6. To describe the extent to which family public housing tenants are receiving help they indicate they need with the activities of daily living.

Chapter 3 reports the findings, in turn, for each of these objectives.

3.1 Background Characteristics, Health Status, Tenant Problems and Social Networks

This section describes the family public housing respondents in terms of selected demographic and social-background characteristics, aspects of their health status, tenant problems and their social networks.

3.1.A Background Characteristics

i) Demographic Characteristics

The respondents ranged in age from 18 to over 60 years of age. Table 3.1.1 shows that forty-two per cent (42.1%) of the respondents were between the ages of 30-39, and twenty-four per cent (24.4%) of the respondents were under the age of 29. The vast majority of the respondents were women (88.3%).

Table 3.1.2 indicates that two-thirds (68.5%) of the respondents were born in Canada, with the remainder born in the West Indies (15.0%), Asian Countries (3.1%), Latin and South America (2.3%), United Kingdom (2.1%) and other countries (9.1%). Of those foreign born, about one-quarter (26.2%) came to Canada before the '70s and two-thirds (65.2%) immigrated to Canada during the '70s.

Close to ninety per cent (86.6%) of the respondents used English all or most of the time; six per cent of the respondents used French (6.3%) and; seven per cent (7.1%) used another language.

TABLE 3.1.1

Family Public Housing Respondents by Age

Age	Percentage
18-29	24.4
30-39	42.1
40-49	19.6
50-59	10.0
60+	2.7
Refusal	.6
Average Age	37.2

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.2

Family Public Housing Respondents by Birthplace

Birthplace	Percentage
Canada	68.5
West Indies	15.0
Asian Countries	3.1
Latin and South America	2.3
United Kingdom	2.1
Portugal	1.3
Greece	1.0
Italy	1.0
Germany	.8
Middle East	.8
Yugoslavia	.6
Netherlands	.4
Other	.4
Poland	.4
Spain	.4
U.S.A.	.4
U.S.S.R.	.4
Vietnam/Laos	.4
African Countries	.2
France	.2
Hungary	.2
Ireland	.2
Malta	.2
Oceania	.2

(Source: Question 10.1)

Total Cases = 521

Very few of the respondents had completed high school. Table 3.1.3 shows that sixty per cent (60.1%) of the respondents had a grade 10 education or less. Most of the family tenants surveyed did not work (70.3%), with only thirteen per cent (13.1%) and ten per cent (10.0%) working full and part-time respectively (see Table 3.1.4).

Seventy per cent (69.7%) of the respondents headed single parent families. Table 3.1.5 shows that the number of members in the household ranged from two (21.1%) to nine or more (.4%) with three person households being most prevalent (33.0%), followed by four person households (26.5%). The number of children in the household ranged from one to seven or more; one-quarter of the families (26.7%) had one child; two-fifths of the families (39.9%) had two children; another quarter of the families (22.5%) had three children and; one-in-ten (11.0%) families had four or more children (see Table 3.1.6).

Table 3.1.7 shows the distribution of families by the age groupings of the children and Table 3.1.8 further breaks these age groupings down by the number of children in the family. These data show the mixture of children's ages within the public housing families, and indicate that the families surveyed have mainly school-aged children. Only about one-quarter (24.5%) of the respondents have pre-school children, and over one-half (54.3%) have teenage children. Table 3.1.9 shows that eight-out-of-ten children (N = 1158) mentioned by the respondents (N = 521)

TABLE 3.1.3

Family Public Housing Respondents by Education

Education	Percentage
Grade 6 or less	9.8
Grades 7 or 8	17.1
Grades 9 or 10	33.2
Grades 11	13.1
Grades 12	16.1
Grades 13	2.1
Some or Completed Post-Secondary	8.1
Refused/Don't know	.6

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 9.2)

TABLE 3.1.4

Family Public Housing Respondents by Employment Status

Employment Status	Percentage
Employed Full-Time	13.1
Employed Part-Time	10.0
Laid Off/Maternity Leave	3.1
Disability	3.6
Not Working	70.3

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 9.3)

TABLE 3.1.5

Family Public Housing Respondents by Number in Household

Number in Household	Percentage
2	21.1
3	33.0
4	26.5
5	13.2
6	3.6
7	1.2
8	1.0
9	.4

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.6

Family Public Housing Respondents by Number of Children in Household

Number of Children in Household*	Percentage
1	26.7
2	39.9
3	22.5
4	7.3
5	2.3
6	.8
7	.6

Total Cases = 521

* This may include child relatives

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.7

Family Public Housing Respondents by Ages of Children

Families with Children	Percentage
Less than 5 years old only	7.3
5 to 12 years only	26.7
Greater than 12 years only	30.6
Less than 5 years and 5 - 12 years	11.7
5 to 12 and over 12 years	18.3
Less than 5 years and over 12 years	2.3
All three age groups	3.1
Average Age of Children	11.2

Total Cases = 520

Missing Cases = 1

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.8

Family Public Housing Respondents by Ages of Children and by Number of Children in the Family

Families with Children	Number of Children				
	1	2	3	4+	Tot
Less than 5 years only	4.6	2.5	.2	0.0	7
5-12 years only	9.6	12.9	3.7	.6	26
Greater than 12 years only	12.3	10.6	5.6	2.1	30
Less than 5 and 5-12 years	-	6.3	3.9	1.5	11
5 to 12 and over 12 years	-	6.9	8.3	3.1	18
Less than 5 and over 12 years	-	.8	.6	1.0	2
All three age groups	-	-	.4	2.7	3
Total	26.5	40.0	22.5	11.0	100
Average Age of Children	11.4	10.6	11.8	11.9	11

Total Cases = 520

Missing Cases = 1

(Source: Question 2.10)

TABLE 3.1.9

Family Public Housing Respondents by Activities of Children

Activities of Children	(N)	%
No. of children under 5 years	(150)	13.0
No. of children 5-12 years in school	(503)	43.4
No. of children over 12 years		
in school	(421)	36.4
working full-time	(29)	2.5
working part-time	(10)	.9
unemployed	(45)	3.9
Total N	(1158)	

(Soure: Question 2.10)

are in school. A small proportion of children over the age of 12 are working, either full-time (2.5%) or part-time (0.9%), and about four per cent (3.9%) are unemployed.

ii) Income

Table 3.1.10 indicates that the families' household monthly income varied from less than $500 per month to over $1200 per month, with over one-half (55.1%) of the respondents having incomes in the $500-$799 range. As expected, incomes were greater for double parent households (see Table 3.1.11) and families with more children (see Table 3.1.12), reflecting the increment to family benefits or welfare payments for each additional member in the family.

Low incomes were a problem for respondents; almost one-quarter (23.4%) indicated regular difficulty finding enough money each month to buy food or pay rent, for example, and another quarter (29.0%) indicated occasional money problems (see Table 3.1.13).

The major source of income for respondents, according to data from the OFIS file, is the family benefits allowance (48.3%), followed by full-time employment (27.7%) and the general welfare allowance (14.0%). Fully, 82.5 per cent of the respondents had no secondary source of income (see Table 3.1.14).

TABLE 3.1.10

Family Public Housing Respondents by Total Household Monthly Income January/February, 1985

Total Household Monthly Income	Percentage
Less than $600 per month	25.8
$600-$799	35.3
$800-$999	17.5
$1000+	17.0
Refused / Don't Know	4.2
Average Income	$755.18

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 8.1)

Data source is income reported on the questionnaire, not OFIS data.

TABLE 3.1.11

Family Public Housing Respondents, Household Monthly Income by Family Type January/February, 1985

Household Monthly Income	Family Type			
	Single Parent		Double Parents	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
Less than $600	(122)	34.6	(13)	8.9
$600 - $799	(145)	41.1	(38)	26.0
$800 - $999	(53)	15.0	(39)	26.7
$1000+	(33)	9.4	(56)	38.4
Total N	(353)		(146)	
Average Income		$723.51		$859.59

Total Cases = 499

Missing Cases = 22

Chi-Square = 87.90 ($p < .01$)

(Source: Questions 2.10, 8.1)

Data source is income reported on the questionnaire, not OFIS data.

TABLE 3.1.12

Family Public Housing Respondents, Total Household Monthly Income by Number of Children in Family January/February, 1985

Household Monthly Income	Number of Children in the Family							
	1		2		3		4	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Less than $600	(82)	61.2	(43)	21.7	(5)	4.6	(4)	7.1
$600 - $799	(23)	17.2	(93)	47.0	(52)	47.3	(15)	26.8
$800 - $999	(13)	9.7	(33)	16.7	(29)	26.4	(17)	30.4
$1000+	(16)	11.9	(29)	14.7	(24)	21.8	(20)	35.7
Total N	(134)		(198)		(110)		(56)	

Total Cases = 499

Missing Cases = 22

Chi-Square = 144.5 (p < .01)

(Source: Questions 2.10, 8.1)

Data source is income reported on the questionnaire, not OFIS data.

TABLE 3.1.13

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Frequency they Experienced Difficulty Finding Enough Money Each Month to Buy Food or Pay Rent

Difficulty Finding Enough Money	Percentage
Never	24.0
Rarely	23.2
Occasionally	29.0
Regularly	23.4
Refusal	.4

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 8.2)

TABLE 3.1.14

Family Public Housing Respondents by Source of Income

Source of Income	Primary	Secondary
None	-	82.5
Family Benefits Allowance	48.3	.6
Full-time Employment	27.7	7.4
General Welfare Allowance	14.0	.2
Gains Disabled	3.1	-
Other	6.9	9.3
Total Cases	520	487
Missing Cases	1	34

Total N = 521

(Source: Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing's Unit Tenant Master File, OFIS data)

This table presents only primary and secondary sources of income. A primary source provides the largest portion of a tenant's income, a secondary source provides the second largest portion. Any additional sources of income are not recorded. Some tenants have only one income source, while others have several. This table may, therefore, under-represent the number of tenants with income from other sources.

3.1.B Health Status

The number of family health conditions reported by the respondents ranged from 0 to 6, with a mean of 1.0. Table 3.1.15 indicates that over one-half (50.9%) of the respondents reported no health conditions; one-fifth (20.2%) of the respondents reported one and; another one-fifth of the respondents reported two (17.1%) health conditions. And, one-in-ten (11.7%) of the respondents indicated that members of their household had three or more health conditions or disabilities. Of those with one or more health conditions in their household, about eighty per cent (79.9%) indicated that these health conditions interferred with daily activities (see Table 3.1.16).

Of those reporting family health conditions, about forty per cent of the problems were experienced by the respondent, fourteen per cent were a spouse's health problems and around forty-five per cent were problems experienced by the respondent's children. While a very wide range of health problems were mentioned, the most common appear to be asthma, emphysema or chronic bronchitis, back problems, high blood pressure, heart trouble or the effects of a stroke, and ear, nose or throat conditions.

TABLE 3.1.15

The Number of Health Conditions Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Number of Health Conditions	Number of Respondents Reporting Health Conditionsá
	%
0	50.9
1	20.2
2	17.1
3	7.5
4	3.1
5 +	1.1

Average Number of Health Conditions .9

Total N = 521

(Source: Question 6.3)

TABLE 3.1.16

The Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With the Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Number of Interfering Health Conditions	Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere With Daily Activities	
	(N)	%
0	(49)	19.1
1	(99)	38.7
2	(69)	27.0
3	(28)	11.0
4	(10)	3.9
5 +	(1)	.3
Average Number of Health Conditions Which Interfere		1.4

Total N = 256

(Source: Question 6.3)

3.1.C Tenant Problems

In a series of questions, respondents were asked if they, their spouse (if applicable) or any of their children had any of a number of problems over the last twelve months. These problems were:

a) problem with your budget

b) difficulties with driving

c) trouble at work or school

d) depression

e) other problems with health

f) tension or disagreement with family or friends

g) trouble with a superintendent manager or housing authority

h) accidental injury to yourself or someone else

i) violent injury to yourself or someone else

j) trouble with the law

k) any other problems (includes problems with welfare office).

The number of problems reported range from 0 to 10 with averages of 2.0, 1.8, and 1.1 for the respondent, his/her spouse and any of his/her children respectively. The average number of problems reported for all family members was 3.8.

Table 3.1.17 displays the per cent of respondents, spouse/friend and children who experienced various numbers of problems over the last year. These data show that the number of problems experienced was greatest for the respondent and their

TABLE 3.1.17

Family Public Housing Respondents, Number of Problems Reported for Respondents, Spouse/Friend and Children

Number of Problems	Percentages			
	Respondent	Spouse Friend	Children	Total
0	24.6	29.7	48.2	13.9
1	22.7	21.5	20.9	14.8
2	18.2	20.3	14.1	14.6
3	15.4	12.0	9.8	12.9
4	10.0	9.5	4.2	10.2
5	6.1	4.4	2.1	6.5
6	2.1	1.3	.6	7.9
7+	.9	1.3	.2	19.3
Average Number of Problems	1.9	1.8	1.1	3.4
Total Cases	(521)	(158)	(521)	(521)

(Source: Questions 6.4, 6.6, 6.7a)

spouse/friends and least for the children (24.6%, 29.7%, 48.2% respectively reported no problems).

Table 3.1.18 shows the per cent of respondents, spouse/friends and children having specific types of problems. The most prevalent problems were with the budget, depression, tension or disagreement with family or friends, problems with health, and accidental injury to yourself or someone else. As well, one-in-five (18.6%) of the respondents indicated that their children were having trouble at work or school.

Does the number and type of children's problems vary by the number of children in the household or the family type? An analysis of the data showed that the number of children's problems was not related to "family size" However, the number of children's problems was greater for single parent families than for double parent families. Table 3.1.19 shows that about sixty-five per cent (65.1%) of children from single parent households had at least one of the problems mentioned as compared to forty-four per cent (44.2%) of the children from double parent families. The type of children's problems was not found to be related to the number of children in the household nor to the family type.

Turning now to life stress, one common way of measuring stress is to assess the number of life events which have occurred within a specified period of time. Researchers have measured the comparative impact of different life events on individuals who

TABLE 3.1.18

Family Public Housing Respondents, Type of Problem Reported for Respondents, Spouse/Friends and Children

Type of Problem	Percentages Having Specific Problem		
	Respondent	Spouse	Children
Problem with your budget	48.4	46.8	8.6
Difficulties with driving	5.8	5.7	1.5
Trouble at work or school	7.5	7.0	18.6
Depression	38.8	31.6	14.2
Other problems with health	25.5	28.5	19.6
Tension or disagreement with family or friends	35.7	25.9	22.3
Trouble with a superintendent manager or housing authority	9.0	6.3	2.1
Accidental injury to yourself or someone else	11.9	11.4	13.6
Violent injury to yourself or someone else	3.8	3.2	3.3
Trouble with the law	4.2	5.7	5.2
Any other problems	1.5	3.2	1.5
Total Cases	(521)	(158)	(521)
(Source: Questions)	Q6-4	Q6-8	Q6-12

TABLE 3.1.19

Family Public Housing Respondents and the Frequency of Children's Problems by Family Type

Number of Problems	Family Type			
	Single Parent		Double Parent	
	(N)	%	(N)	%
0	(163)	44.9	(88)	55.7
1	(85)	23.4	(24)	15.2
2	(51)	14.1	(22)	13.9
3	(36)	9.9	(15)	9.5
4	(14)	3.9	(8)	5.1
5+	(14)	3.9	(1)	.6
Total Cases	(363)		(158)	

Chi-Square = 10.6 (p > .05)

(Source: Question 6.12)

have actually experienced them and had these people identify those which had the greatest impact on peoples' lives (Brim, O.G. et al. 1980, Brown, K. et al. 1982, Davis C., 1985). In this study, respondents were given a list of these life events and asked to indicate those which "happened to you in the last twelve months". The list included:

a) stopped full-time schooling
b) lost job, or was unemployed
c) got married
d) someone moved in with you
e) had financial problems
f) you and your spouse/partner separated
g) arrival of a baby at home
h) someone moved out of your home
i) serious illness
j) serious illness of someone dear
k) quit or retired from full-time work
l) started working or changed job
m) death of someone dear
n) problems with the law.

The number of life events experienced by respondents ranged from 0 to 8, with an average of 2.1. Table 3.1.20 shows that the number of life events reported by respondents varied. Less than one-fifth (18.0%) indicated that none of these events occurred within the last year, almost one-half (47.3%) of the respondents reported one or two events and another quarter (26.7%) reported three or four life events. Table 3.1.21 shows the per cent who

TABLE 3.1.20

Family Public Housing Respondents by Frequency of Life Events

Number of Life Events	Percentages
0	18.0
1	24.8
2	22.5
3	16.7
4	10.0
5	4.6
6	1.9
7	1.3
8	.2

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 6.15)

experienced each type of life event within the last year. These data indicate that, in order of prevalence, the most common events were financial problems (51.1%), loss of job or being unemployed (25.5%), the death (22.5%) or serious illness (24.4%) of someone dear, someone moved out of your home (16.7%), a serious illness (11.5%), a separation (11.3%), started work or changed jobs (11.1%), stopped full-time schooling (9.4%), arrival of a baby at home (7.1%), someone moved in with you (4.6%), quit or retired from full-time work (4.2%), problems with the law (3.8%) and got married (1.9%).

TABLE 3.1.21

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Life Events Reported

Life Events	Percentages
Had financial problems	51.1
Lost job, or was unemployed	25.5
Serious illness of someone dear	24.4
Death of someone dear	22.5
Someone moved out of your home	16.7
Serious illness	11.5
You and your spouse/partner separated	11.3
Started working or changed job	11.1
Stopped full-time schooling	9.4
Arrival of a baby at home	7.1
Someone moved in with you	4.6
Quit or retired from full-time work	4.2
Problems with the law	3.8
Got married	1.9

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Question 6.15)

3.1.D Social Networks

Fully 33.6 per cent of the respondents had children living elsewhere; 79.5 per cent had relatives other than children and 80.4 per cent reported friends.

The frequency with which the respondents had contact with children, other relatives and friends varied by the type of contact. Table 3.1.22 indicates that about one- quarter (24.2%) of respondents spoke on the phone with children living elsewhere at least once a week and; over one-half (54.1%) of the respondents talked on the phone at least once a week with a relative or friend (60.4%).

Visiting tends to be less frequent than telephone contact. About one-in-ten (15.9%) respondents either had a child visit them in their home or visited in their children's home (7.3%) every week. Visiting with friends and other relatives appears to be fairly frequent. One-third (32.8%) of family respondents either visited in a friend's home or had a friend visit in their home (35.9%) once a week or more. About one-quarter of respondents had a similar visiting pattern with relatives other than children.

To determine the frequency of social contact the respondents had on a monthly basis, an index was constructed. The index is a measure of the total number of contacts per month. The range on this index is from "0" (no social contact) to over 100

TABLE 3.1.22

Frequency and Type of Contact With Children, Relatives and Friends Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Type of Contact	Frequency of Contact (Percentages)				
	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times Per Month	Once a Week or More	Not Applicable
Phone Contact					
Children	2.9	4.2	1.9	24.2	66.4
Relatives	4.8	12.3	6.0	54.1	20.5
Friends	4.0	8.8	7.1	60.4	19.6
Visiting in Other's Home					
Children	9.4	13.4	3.1	7.3	66.4
Relatives	7.5	33.4	9.6	26.7	20.5
Friends	6.7	28.6	12.3	32.8	19.6
Visiting in Respondent's					
Children	4.2	7.5	5.6	15.9	66.4
Relatives	9.2	37.0	10.0	20.9	20.5
Friends	5.0	25.3	14.2	35.9	19.6

Percentage may not sum to 100.0 due to 2.3 per cent who refused to answer the questions.

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 2.4, 2.6, 2.9)

contacts per month (see Table 3.1.23). These data indicate that over the period of a month, five per cent of respondents had no social contacts. Eleven per cent (11.3%) of respondents had fewer than ten social contacts; forty-six per cent (45.7%) of those surveyed had 20-49 contacts and; about one-quarter (27.1%) of the family respondents had fifty or more contacts per month.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend within the local community or outside the community. Table 3.1.24 indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend in the same city or community was 24.8 per cent, 59.7 per cent and 75.9 per cent respectively. About nine per cent (8.6%) of the respondents reported that they had no children or relatives or friends on whom they could depend in the local community.

How likely are families to turn to informal sources of support for problems as compared to formal sources? In this survey, respondents were asked to identify whom they would most likely turn to for a series of eight problems. These included:

a) take care of children for an hour

b) take care of children for a week

c) regular help with transportation to a hard-to-reach place

d) help with a large expense

e) someone to talk with if you were bored or lonely and wanted to talk

f) if you were really depressed about some serious problem and needed someone to listen

TABLE 3.1.23

Number of Social Contacts Per Month Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Number of Social Contacts per Month	Percentage
0	5.0
1-9	11.3
10-19	10.9
20-29	14.8
30-39	15.5
40-49	15.4
50-59	10.6
60-69	6.1
70-79	4.6
80-89	3.8
90-99	1.0
100+	1.0

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 2.4, 2.6, 2.9)

TABLE 3.1.24

Number and Percentage of Family Public Housing Respondents Reporting Children Living Elsewhere, Relatives and Friends on Whom They Can Depend by the Location of Contacts

Social Network	Local Contacts	Contacts Outside the City or Community
Children (elsewhere)	24.8	14.4
Relatives	59.7	47.2
Friends	75.9	36.1

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 2.3, 2.8)

g) advice on some aspect of how to deal with your children.

Table 3.1.25 shows that, while it varies from problem to problem, respondents said they would be more likely to turn to informal sources of support (i.e. relatives, neighbours and friends) than formal sources if they needed help for problems they may encounter.

For two of the problems mentioned there was a greater tendency for respondents to indicate they would look to formal sources of support. Almost eighteen per cent (17.5%) said they would turn to formal sources if they were "really depressed about some serious problem and needed someone to listen" and almost one-third (32.3%) of respondents would seek formal support for "advice on some aspect of how to deal with your children".

TABLE 3.1.25

Family Public Housing Respondents Turning to Various Sources of Support if They Needed Help for Problems they May Encounter

Problem	No one/ Never In Need	Informal Sources	Formal Sources	Don't Know/Refused/ Other
Take care of children for an hour	16.3	79.1	-	4.5
Take care of children for a week	10.9	82.8	1.7	4.6
Regular help with transportation to a hard-to-reach place	14.2	64.5	5.6	15.7
Help with a large expense	25.7	59.8	6.3	9.4
Someone to talk with if you were bored or lonely and wanted to talk	6.9	88.1	3.7	1.3
If you were really depressed about some serious problem and needed someone to listen	7.3	70.8	17.5	4.2
Advice in some aspect of how to deal with your children	7.3	53.7	32.3	6.8

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 5.1, ..., 5.8)

3.2 Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living

This section describes the difficulties with activities of daily living reported by family public housing tenants. The ability of respondents to carry out activities of daily living is measured with the use of a set of ten items. These items or activites are:

a) heavy cleaning

b) shopping for groceries

c) managing the family budget and making ends meet

d) getting around the community on your own

e) dealing with problems or crises for yourself or other adult family members

f) dealing with your child/children's emotional and behaviour problems

g) child rearing and parenting generally

h) providing regular or occasional child care for your child/children under 12

i) providing for recreation and other leisure activities for your child/children under 12

j) getting information about government or community programs or services or any other help you might need.

The respondents were asked to indicate whether they could do the activity with "no difficulty", with a "little difficulty", with a "lot of difficulty" or whether they "could not do the activity at all by themselves". If the respondents indicated they had "a little difficulty", or "a lot of difficulty" or "could not do the activity at all by themselves", they were defined as having a difficulty.

Respondents were also defined as having a difficulty if they indicated that they received essential help within the past year for a particular activity, even though they initially indicated they had no difficulty with the activity. Presumably, these respondents said they had no difficulty with the activity since they had help and were able to get by with this assistance (see Table 3.2.1, Column D).

The number of difficulties with activities of daily living reported ranged from 0 to 10, with an average of 3.8. Table 3.2.2 shows that 11.3 per cent of respondents reported no difficulties; 35.7 per cent of respondents reported having one to three difficulties; 35.5 per cent of respondents indicated four to six difficulties; and 17.4 per cent of respondents reported seven or more difficulties with activities of daily living. An analysis of the data showed that the number of difficulties was not related to the number of children in the family nor to whether the family was a single or double parent household.

Table 3.2.3 shows that seventy per cent (69.5%) of respondents had difficulties managing the family budget and making ends meet. Nearly one-half (49.3%) of respondents had problems or difficulties dealing with crises for themselves or other adult family members, shopping for groceries (45.9%) and dealing with their child/children's emotional and behavioural problems (42.6%). One-third (32.0%) of the family respondents had difficulty with child rearing and parenting generally (32.0%).

TABLE 3.2.1

Family Public Housing Respondents: Their Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living, Their Receipt of Help and Their Ability to Get by Without the Help Received

	Difficulty With Activity						No Difficulty With Activity						
	Received Help				Did Not Receive Help		Received Help				Did Not Receive Help		
	Could Not Get By Without Help		Could Get By Without Help				Could Not Get By Without Help		Could Get By Without Help				
	(A)		(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)		(F)		Total N
Activities of Daily Living	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)
Grocery Shopping	(118)	22.7	(9)	1.7	(69)	13.2	(43)	8.3	(33)	6.3	(249)	47.8	(521)
Child Care	(49)	13.4	(8)	2.2	(23)	6.3	(74)	20.2	(23)	6.3	(190)	51.8	(367)
Adult Personal Problems	(127)	24.4	(8)	1.5	(112)	21.5	(10)	1.9	(2)	.4	(262)	50.3	(521)
Heavy Cleaning	(67)	12.9	(5)	1.0	(74)	14.2	(31)	6.0	(26)	5.0	(318)	61.0	(521)
Children's Behavioural Problems	(102)	19.6	(9)	1.7	(102)	19.6	(9)	1.7	(4)	.7	(295)	56.6	(521)
Making Ends Meet	(105)	20.1	(5)	.1	(245)	47.0	(7)	1.0	(2)	.4	(157)	30.0	(521)
Transportation	(69)	13.2	(4)	.8	(45)	38.1	(24)	4.6	(8)	1.5	(371)	71.2	(521)
Providing Recreation for Children	(46)	12.5	(6)	1.6	(76)	20.7	(24)	6.5	(13)	3.5	(202)	55.0	(367)
Getting Information	(32)	6.2	(1)	.1	(57)	11.0	(38)	7.3	(8)	1.5	(384)	73.9	(520)
Child Rearing and Parenting	(56)	10.8	(4)	.8	(94)	18.0	(13)	2.5	(6)	1.2	(348)	66.8	(521)

TABLE 3.2.2

Number of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Number of Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living	Per Cent
None Reported	11.3
1	10.6
2	13.2
3	11.9
4	14.0
5	12.1
6	9.4
7	6.9
8	6.5
9	2.7
10	1.3
Average Number of Difficulties	3.8

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2, ..., 3.10)

TABLE 3.2.3

Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents

Activities of Daily Living	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(239)	45.9
Child Care	(154)	42.0*
Adult Personal Problems	(257)	49.3
Heavy Cleaning	(177)	34.0
Children's Behavioural Problems	(222)	42.6
Making Ends Meet	(362)	69.5
Transportation	(142)	27.3
Providing Recreation for Children	(152)	41.4*
Getting Information	(129)	24.8
Child Rearing and Parenting	(167)	32.0

Total Cases = 521

* Total Cases = 367 for those with children under 12

Respondents with difficulties include those who indicated they had no difficulty, although they indicated essential help within the past year (i.e. they could not get by without difficulty if this help was removed). See Table 3.2.1, Columns A, B, C, D.

Of those with children under 12, over forty per cent (42.0%) had difficulty providing regular or occasional child care and providing for recreation and other leisure activities (41.4%). One-third (34.0%) of the respondents reported difficulties with heavy cleaning and; one-quarter (27.3%) of those surveyed reported difficulties getting around the community on their own, and getting information about government or community programs or services or any other help they might need (24.8%).

While the number of difficulties did not vary by family type or the number of children in the family, the type of problem did. Single parent families were more likely than double parent families to report problems shopping for groceries (49.0%, N = 178 vs. 38.6%, N = 61 respectively). Specific problems mentioned included "too much to carry", "transportation problem", and "lack of money". As well, families with one child, as compared to larger families, were more likely to mention problems with shopping for groceries and getting around the community on their own (see Table 3.2.4).

TABLE 3.2.4

Type of Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents by Number of Children

Difficulty	Number of Children										
	1		2		3		4		Total		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	Chi-Square
Shopping for groceries	(78)	56.5	(91)	43.8	(46)	39.3	(24)	42.1	(239)	45.9	9.1 (p < .05)
Getting around the community on your own	(52)	37.7	(54)	26.0	(24)	20.5	(12)	21.1	(142)	27.3	11.5 (p < .05)

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 2.10, 3.1, 3.2, ..., 3.10)

Column numbers do not sum to 100 per cent because each category (i.e. shopping for groceries) is taken from a separate table. Missing from this table are the percentages by number of children not having this difficulty.

3.3 Assistance Received With Activities of Daily Living

This section describes the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by family public housing tenants.

3.3.A Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

The use of assistance by families in public housing was examined in relation to the ten activities of daily living discussed above.

Table 3.3.1 (Column F) shows the percentage of family respondents who received assistance with the activities of daily living. About forty per cent (39.0%) of respondents had assistance for grocery shopping and thiry per cent (29.6%) of respondents had received help for child care and adult personal problems (28.2%) within the past year. About one-quarter (24.8%) of family respondents received help with heavy cleaning and childrens' behavioural problems (23.8%). Around one-fifth (22.8%) of respondents received assistance making ends meet and with transporation (20.2%). And, just over fifteen per cent (17.1%) of those surveyed had help with providing recreation for their children, getting information (15.4%) and child rearing and parenting generally (15.2%).

TABLE 3.3.1

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living

Activities of Daily Living	Had Help	
	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(203)	39.0
Child Care	(154)	29.6
Adult Personal Problems	(147)	28.2
Heavy Cleaning	(129)	24.8
Children's Behavioural Problems	(124)	23.8
Making Ends Meet	(119)	22.8
Transportation	(105)	20.2
Providing Recreation for Children	(89)	17.1
Getting Information	(80)	15.4
Child Rearing and Parenting	(79)	15.2

Total N = 521

3.3.B Frequency of Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

Table 3.3.2 shows that the frequency of help received with activities of daily living varied by activity. The most frequent assistance received was for heavy cleaning, providing recreation for children and child rearing and parenting. For these activities, the majority of respondents had help at least once, and often, several times a week. Assistance for grocery shopping, child care, adult personal problems, children's behavioural problems, making ends meet and transportation was received on a less frequent basis -- typically once or twice a month. Assistance with getting information was received less frequently -- less than once a month for 47.5 per cent of respondents.

3.3.C Length of Time Help Was Received With Activities of Daily Living

The length of time assistance had been received varied across activities from less than six months to over four years. For heavy cleaning (41.1%, N = 53), and grocery shopping (38.9%, N = 79), about forty per cent of those receiving help had this assistance for more than four years. And, about one-quarter (22.1%, N = 34) of respondents had help with child care, adult personal problems (22.4%, N = 33) and transportation (25.7%, N = 27) for four years or more (see Table 3.3.3).

TABLE 3.3.2

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage with Difficulties who are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Frequency of Help Received

Activities of Daily Living	Frequency													
	4 times a week or more		2-3 times a week		once a week		1- 3 times a month		less than once a month		other		total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(4)	2.0	(18)	8.9	(62)	30.5	(84)	41.4	(30)	14.8	(5)	2.5	(203)	100.0
Child Care	(35)	22.7	(21)	13.6	(17)	11.0	(45)	29.2	(27)	17.5	(9)	5.8	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(16)	10.9	(15)	10.2	(16)	10.9	(48)	32.7	(40)	27.2	(12)	8.2	(147)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(33)	25.6	(13)	10.1	(43)	33.3	(13)	10.1	(21)	16.3	(6)	4.7	(129)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problems	(13)	10.5	(11)	8.9	(21)	16.9	(33)	26.6	(31)	25.0	(15)	12.1	(124)	100.0
Making ends Meet	(4)	3.4	(2)	1.7	(11)	9.2	(55)	46.2	(34)	28.6	(13)	10.9	(119)	100.0
Transportation	(9)	8.6	(12)	11.4	(19)	18.1	(44)	41.9	(17)	16.2	(4)	3.8	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for Children	(12)	13.5	(15)	16.9	(23)	25.8	(15)	16.9	(15)	16.9	(9)	10.1	(89)	100.0
Getting Information	(2)	2.5	(1)	1.2	(5)	6.3	(16)	20.0	(38)	47.5	(18)	22.5	(80)	100.0
Child rearing and Parenting	(19)	24.1	(11)	13.9	(11)	13.9	(17)	21.5	(12)	15.2	(9)	11.4	(79)	100.00

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

TABLE 3.3.3

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Assistance With the Activities of Daily Living by Length of Time Help Received

Activities of Daily Living	Length of Time															
	A Few Times Only		Less Than 6 Months		6 Months To 1 Year		More Than 1 To 2 Years		More Than 2 To 3 Years		More Than 3 To 4 Years		Over 4 Years		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(7)	3.4	(17)	8.4	(34)	16.7	(37)	18.2	(20)	9.9	(9)	4.4	(79)	38.9	(203)	100.0
Child Care	(6)	3.9	(21)	13.6	(38)	24.7	(33)	21.4	(15)	9.7	(7)	4.5	(34)	22.1	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(12)	8.2	(32)	21.8	(39)	26.5	(20)	13.6	(6)	4.1	(5)	3.4	(33)	22.4	(147)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(4)	3.1	(16)	12.4	(19)	14.7	(18)	14.0	(12)	9.3	(7)	5.4	(53)	41.1	(129)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problem	(18)	14.5	(36)	29.0	(22)	17.7	(16)	12.9	(15)	12.1	-	-	(17)	13.7	(124)	100.0
Making Ends Meet	(12)	10.1	(26)	21.8	(17)	14.3	(25)	21.0	(13)	10.9	(4)	3.4	(22)	18.5	(119)	100.0
Transportation	(2)	1.9	(13)	12.4	(25)	23.8	(21)	20.0	(12)	11.4	(5)	4.8	(27)	25.7	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for children	(4)	4.5	(15)	16.9	(25)	28.1	(19)	21.2	(8)	9.0	(3)	3.4	(15)	16.9	(89)	100.0
Getting Information	(23)	28.8	(12)	15.0	(17)	21.3	(6)	7.5	(8)	10.0	(5)	6.3	(9)	11.3	(80)	100.0
Child Rearing and Parenting	(3)	3.8	(17)	21.5	(24)	30.4	(12)	15.2	(6)	7.6	(3)	3.8	(14)	17.8	(79)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.D Duration of Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

Most of the respondents receiving assistance had help on a regular and on-going basis: i.e. grocery shopping (68.5%, N = 139), followed by heavy cleaning (68.2%, N = 88), child rearing and parenting (51.9%, N = 41), providing recreation for children (49.4%, N = 44), transportation (48.6%, N = 51) and making ends meet (46.2%, N = 55). About one-half of assistance with child care (48.7%, N = 75) and getting information (52.5%, N = 42) was on an ongoing/occasional basis (see Table 3.3.4).

3.3.E Arrangements for Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

The family respondents tended to make their own arrangements for assistance with child care (85.7%, N = 132), transportation (82.9%, N = 87), grocery shopping (81.3%, N = 165), heavy cleaning (78.3%, N = 101), adult personal problems (70.1%, N = 103), making ends meet (69.7%, N = 83), getting information (68.4%, N = 54), child rearing and parenting (59.5%, N = 47), providing recreation for children (56.8%, N = 50) and children's behavioural problems (49.2%, N = 61).

Arrangements were sometimes made by physicians for adult personal problems (14.3%, N = 21), children's behavioural problems (12.1%, N = 15) and child rearing and parenting (11.4%, N = 9). Also, for about fifteen per cent of respondents, relatives arranged for assistance with heavy cleaning (17.0%, N = 22), grocery shopping (13.8%, N = 28) and providing recreation for children (12.5%, N = 11). Neighbours or friends also occasionally arranged recreation for children (13.6%, N = 12).

TABLE 3.3.4

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage with Difficulties who are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Duration of Help

Activities of Daily Living	Duration									
	Once		Ongoing/ Regular		Ongoing/ Occasional		Time Limited		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(7)	3.4	(139)	68.5	(49)	24.1	(8)	3.9	(203)	100.0
Child Care	(3)	1.9	(69)	44.8	(75)	48.7	(7)	4.5	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(12)	8.2	(58)	39.5	(51)	34.7	(26)	17.7	(147)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(3)	2.3	(88)	68.2	(27)	20.9	(11)	8.5	(129)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problems	(15)	12.1	(49)	39.5	(37)	29.8	(23)	18.5	(124)	100.0
Making Ends Meet	(8)	6.7	(55)	46.2	(42)	35.3	(14)	11.8	(119)	100.0
Transportation	(1)	1.0	(51)	48.6	(46)	43.8	(7)	6.7	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for Children	(4)	4.5	(44)	49.4	(28)	31.5	(13)	14.6	(89)	100.0
Getting Information	(18)	22.5	(13)	16.3	(42)	52.5	(7)	8.8	(80)	100.0
Child Rearing and Parenting	(4)	5.1	(41)	51.9	(19)	24.1	(15)	19.0	(79)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

TABLE 3.3.5

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by How Help Was Arranged

Activities of Daily Living	How Help Was Arranged													
	Respondent		Relatives		Physician		Neighbours/ Friends		Community Group		Other		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(165)	81.3	(28)	13.8	(1)	0.5	(4)	2.0	-	-	(5)	1.0	(203)	100.0
Child Care	(132)	85.7	(9)	5.8	-	-	(3)	1.9	(2)	1.3	(8)	5.2	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(103)	70.1	(3)	2.0	(21)	14.3	(5)	3.4	(3)	2.0	(12)	8.2	(147)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(101)	78.3	(22)	17.0	(2)	1.6	(1)	0.8	(2)	1.6	(1)	0.8	(129)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problems	(61)	49.2	(2)	1.6	(15)	12.1	(2)	1.6	(8)	6.6	(36)	29.0	(124)	100.0
Making Ends Meet	(83)	69.7	(8)	6.7	-	-	(2)	1.7	(6)	5.0	(20)	16.8	(119)	100.0
Transportation	(87)	82.9	(8)	7.6	(1)	1.0	(3)	2.9	(2)	1.9	(4)	3.8	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for Children	(50)	56.8	(11)	12.5	-	-	(12)	13.6	(8)	9.1	(7)	8.0	(88)	100.0
Getting Information	(54)	68.4	(2)	2.5	-	-	(4)	5.1	(3)	3.8	(16)	20.3	(79)	100.0
Child Rearing and Parenting	(47)	59.5	(4)	5.1	(9)	11.4	(1)	1.3	(4)	5.1	(14)	17.7	(79)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

3.3.F Use of Formal Services

Respondents were asked, if in the past year they or any family member had ever received help from a list of twenty-six various community services such as health services, school social workers, homemaker service and many others. On average, family respondents and/or their family members used 2.8 services within the past year.

Table 3.3.6 indicates that eighty-seven per cent of the respondents and/or their family members used at least one service. Almost the same proportion (16.5%) of families used exactly one, two (17.3%), three (16.3%), and four (13.8%) services. Service use then tapered off with 7.5 per cent and 6.1 per cent of families having used five and six services respectively. Fully 8.9 per cent of the families used seven or more services within the past year.

Table 3.3.7 shows that the most frequently used services in the past year were family benefits workers (41.1%), health services (40.3%), other income maintenance (24.0%), police (24.0%), housing project staff including maintenance (21.9%), educational upgrading programs (16.1%), recreational community drop-in centres (15.5%), job counselling (12.7%), counselling on family law matters (11.3%), pre-school child day care programs (10.9%), and Children's Aid Society (10.6%). For a detailed analyses of the frequency and arrangement for these services, see Appendix 1.

TABLE 3.3.6

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Number of Services Used

Number of Services	Percentage
0	13.4
1	16.5
2	17.3
3	16.3
4	13.8
5	7.5
6	6.1
7	3.8
8	1.3
9	1.9
10 +	1.9

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 4.1, ..., 4.9)

TABLE 3.3.7

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used

Community Service	Percentage
Family Benefits Workers	41.1
Health Services	40.3
Other Income Maintenance	24.0
Police	24.0
Housing Project Staff (including maintenance)	21.9
Educational Upgrading Program	16.1
Recreational/Community	15.5
Job Counselling	12.7
Counselling on Family Law Matters	11.3
Preschool Child Day Care Programs	10.9
Children's Aid Society	10.6
Other	10.0
School Social Workers	9.8
Mental Health Services for Adults	6.5
Charities	6.3
Community Information and Referral Service	6.1
Big Brothers/Big Sisters	6.1
Family Counselling Service	5.0
Children's Mental Health Services	4.4
Before and After School Child Care Programs	3.5
Parenting Education	3.3
Nutrition Counselling Service	3.3
Family Planning (Birth Control) Service	2.5
Credit/Budget Counselling	2.1
Homemaker-Service	1.9
Alcohol and Drug Counselling Service	1.5

Total Cases = 521

(Source: Questions 4.1, 4.2, ..., 4.9)

TABLE 3.3.8

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Proportion of Respondents who Are Not Able to Get By Without the Service and the Proportion of Respondents Who Are Only Able to Get By With A Lot of Difficulty Without the Service

Community Service	A Not Able to Get By		B Able to Get By with A Lot of Difficulty		Total of A + B	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Family Benefits Workers	(74)	34.9	(97)	45.8	(171)	80.7
Health Services	(50)	23.8	(89)	42.4	(139)	66.2
Other Income Maintenance	(41)	33.1	(55)	44.4	(96)	77.5
Police	(11)	8.8	(46)	36.8	(57)	45.6
Housing Project Staff (including maintenance)	(15)	13.4	(52)	46.4	(67)	59.8
Educational Upgrading Program	(5)	6.2	(30)	37.1	(35)	43.3
Recreational/Community	(1)	1.2	(17)	21.0	(18)	22.2
Job Counselling	(4)	6.3	(20)	31.3	(24)	37.6
Counselling on Family Law Matters	(10)	16.9	(27)	45.8	(37)	62.7
Preschool Child Day Care Programs	(9)	16.1	(26)	46.4	(35)	62.5
Children's Aid Society	(6)	11.3	(18)	34.0	(24)	45.3
School Social Workers	(4)	8.2	(18)	36.7	(22)	44.9
Mental Health Services for Adults	(3)	8.8	(20)	58.8	(23)	67.6
Community Information and Referral Service	(1)	3.1	(14)	43.8	(15)	46.9
Big Brothers/Big Sisters	-	-	(6)	18.8	(6)	18.8
Family Counselling Service	(4)	15.4	(11)	42.3	(15)	57.7
Children's Mental Health Services	(3)	13.0	(13)	56.5	(16)	69.5

(See Appendix A - Tables A.1.2 to A.1.17)

Table 3.3.8 shows the proportion of respondents receiving a service who could not get by without the service and who could get by only with a lot of difficulty without the service. According to this definition, the most essential services appear to be family benefits (80.7%), other income maintenance (77.5%), children's mental health services (69.5%), mental health services for adults (67.6%), health services (66.2%), counselling on family law matters (62.7%), preschool child day care programs (62.5%), housing project staff (59.8%) and family counselling services (57.7%).

Analysis of the data indicates that the number of services used is not related to family type (i.e. single parent family or double parent family), or to the number of children in the family. While the type of service used did not vary by family size, there is some variation in the type of service used by family type. Double parent families were more likely to use health services and job counselling than single parent families. Single parent families were more likely to use counselling on family law matters, family benefit workers, and recreational community drop-in centres than double parent families (see Table 3.3.8).

TABLE 3.3.9

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Type of Community Services Used by Family Type

Received Help From:	Family Type						
	Total		Single Parent		Double Parent		Chi-Square
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	
Family Benefit Workers	(214)	41.2	(181)	49.9	(33)	21.0	37.7 (p < .01)
Health Services	(210)	40.3	(132)	36.4	(78)	49.4	7.7 (p < .01)
Recreational/Community Drop-In Centres	(81)	15.7	(67)	18.7	(14)	8.9	7.9 (p < .01)
Job Counselling	(66)	12.7	(33)	9.1	(33)	20.9	13.9 (p < .01)
Family Law Matters	(59)	11.3	(48)	13.2	(11)	7.0	4.3 (p < .05)

Total Cases = 521

Column numbers do not sum to 100.0 per cent because each category (i.e. Health Services) is taken from a separate table. Missing from this table are the percentages by age of those not having this difficulty.

(Source: Questions 4.1, 4.2, ..., 4.9)

3.4 Providers of Assistance With Activities of Daily Living

Table 3.4.1 indicates the sources of assistance used by the respondents having help with the activities of daily living. The most frequent providers of assistance were community agencies (29.8%), family other than children (21.0%), friends or neighbours (19.5%), children (16.7%), spouse (9.8%) and paid help (2.5%). About two-thirds of all assistance received by family respondents was provided by informal sources of support.

Table 3.4.2 shows the sources of assistance for each of the eight activities of daily living, and indicates important variation across activities. Examining the "Total Informal" and the "Total Formal" columns, the data illustrate that assistance with getting information (77.5%, N = 62), children's behavioural problems (77.4%, N = 96), and heavy cleaning (59.2%, N = 87) came mainly from formal sources of assistance. Assistance with heavy cleaning (95.3%, N = 123), grocery shopping (93.6%, N = 190), transportation (88.6%, N = 93), child care (76.0%, N = 117) came mainly from informal sources. Help with making ends meet came about equally from both informal (54.6%, N = 65) and formal sources (45.4%, N = 54) of assistance. And, assistance with child rearing and parenting also came about equally from informal (45.6%, N = 36) and formal sources (54.4%, N = 43).

TABLE 3.4.1

Family Public Housing Respondents by the Percentage of Total Assistance Provided by Various Sources

Type of Assistance	%
Community Agencies	29.8
Other Family	21.0
Friend/Neighbour	19.5
Children	16.7
Spouse	9.8
Paid Help	2.5
Other	.7

Total Types of Assistance = 1506

TABLE 3.4.2

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage of Activities of Daily Living by Source of Assistance

Activities of Daily Living	Informal Sources										Formal Sources							
	Children		Other Family		Friends/ Neighbours		Spouse/ Housemate		Total Informal		Project Staff		Community Agency		Other Formal		Total Formal	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(76)	37.4	(37)	18.2	(38)	18.7	(39)	19.2	(190)	93.6	(1)	0.5	(4)	2.0	(8)	4.0	(13)	6.4
Child Care	(10)	6.5	(45)	29.2	(53)	34.4	(9)	5.8	(117)	76.0	-	-	(16)	10.4	(21)	13.6	(37)	24.0
Adult Personal Problems	(6)	4.1	(25)	17.0	(21)	14.3	(8)	5.4	(60)	40.8	(2)	1.4	(30)	20.4	(55)	37.4	(87)	59.2
Heavy Cleaning	(61)	47.3	(17)	13.2	(17)	13.2	(28)	21.7	(123)	95.3	-	-	(6)	4.7	-	-	(6)	4.7
Children's Behaviour Problems	(2)	1.6	(14)	11.3	(6)	4.8	(6)	4.8	(28)	22.6	-	-	(49)	39.5	(47)	37.9	(96)	77.4
Making Ends Meet	(16)	13.4	(27)	22.7	(10)	8.4	(12)	10.1	(65)	54.6	-	-	(40)	33.6	(14)	11.8	(54)	45.4
Transportation	(14)	13.3	(33)	31.4	(38)	36.2	(8)	7.6	(93)	88.6	-	-	(5)	4.8	(7)	6.7	(12)	11.4
Providing Recreation for Children	(1)	1.1	(15)	16.9	(14)	15.7	(4)	4.5	(34)	38.2	(2)	2.2	(46)	51.7	(7)	1.1	(55)	61.8
Getting Information	(2)	2.5	(4)	5.0	(11)	13.8	(1)	1.2	(18)	22.5	(4)	5.0	(41)	51.3	(17)	21.3	(62)	77.5
Child Rearing and Parenting	(2)	2.5	(13)	16.5	(5)	6.3	(16)	20.3	(36)	45.6	-	-	(27)	34.2	(16)	20.3	(43)	54.4

3.5 Factors Relating to the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support

3.5.1 Introduction

As indicated earlier, the sources of assistance received varied according to the type of activity of daily living. This section examines the relationships between the respondents' backbround characteristics, health status, the frequency of their social contacts, their problems and the municipalities in which they live, and (i) the receipt of informal assistance and (ii) the receipt of formal assistance.

A measure of the use of informal assistance was created by summing help received by children, other family, friends and neighbours across the ten activities of daily living. For example, if a respondent received help from a child doing heavy cleaning and help from a neighbour shopping for groceries, he/she would have a score of 2 on the measure of the frequency of informal assistance. Similarly, a measure of the use of formal assistance is created by summing help from community agencies, paid help and other formal sources across the ten activities of daily living.

Measures of the background characteristics, health status, the frequency of social contacts and tenant problems are developed in Section 3.1 of this report. Included in the list of background characteristics are age, number of years of formal education, employment status, birthplace, family type (i.e., double or single parent family), number and ages of children, total household monthly income and primary source of income.

The measure of health status utilized is the number of interfering health conditions. Social contacts are measured by the number of social contacts, either in person or by telephone, with children, other family, friends or neighbours per month.

Several measures of tenant problems are utilized: the frequency of respondents' troubles, the frequency of childrens' troubles, the frequency of spouse/partners' troubles, frequency of life events and difficulty finding enough money.

Table 3.5.1 summarizes the factors that are related to the type of assistance received. The table shows that the most significant discriminators are the number of interfering health conditions, the frequency of social contacts, measures of tenant problems and municipality of residence.

TABLE 3.5.1

Summary of the Significant Relationships Between the Frequency of Informal and Formal Assistance Received by Family Public Housing Respondents and their Background Characteristics, Health Status and Frequency of Social Contact and Tenant Problems

	Frequency of Formal Assistance	Frequency of Informal Assistance
Background Characteristics		
Age		
Birthplace		
Family Type		
Number of Children in the Home		
Age of Children		
Education		
Employment Status		
Total Household Monthly Income		
Health Status		
Number of Interfering Health Conditions	*	*
Social Networks		
Frequency of Social Contact		*
Tenant Problems		
Frequency of Life Events	*	*
Frequency of Respondents Troubles	*	*
Frequency of Child's Troubles	*	*
Frequency of Spouses Troubles	*	*
Difficulty Finding Enough Money		*
Municipality	*	*

* Indicates the relationship is significant at the .05 level or less.

3.5.2 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Background Characteristics and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

An analysis was done of the relationship between the receipt of assistance from informal and formal sources of support, and the respondents' background characteristics. This analysis shows that the receipt of assistance -- whether from informal or formal sources -- is not related to the respondents' age, birthplace, family type, number of children in the home, ages of these children, level of education, employment status, total household monthly income, or their primary source of income.

3.5.3 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Health Status and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

The number of health conditions that interfere with everyday activities is related to the receipt of assistance from both formal and informal sources of support. Table 3.5.2 shows that respondents and their families with two or more interfering health conditions were more likely to receive assistance from formal sources with activities of daily living than are those without interfering health conditions. And, the greater the number of interfering health conditions, the greater the assistance from formal supports. For example, forty-five per cent (45.0%, N = 49) of respondents and their families with two or more interfering health conditions had assistance from formal sources on two or more of the activities of daily living.

Similarly, respondents and their families with interfering health conditions were more likely to have assistance from informal sources of support. For example, one-third of those with two or more interfering conditions had informal assistance on three or more activities of daily living.

TABLE 3.5.2

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Number of Health Conditions Interfering A Little or A Great Deal With Daily Activities

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Health Conditions Interfering A Little or A Great Deal							
	0		1		2 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(195)	62.3	(48)	48.5	(36)	33.0	(279)	53.6
1	(62)	19.8	(23)	23.2	(24)	22.0	(109)	20.9
2 +	(56)	17.9	(28)	28.3	(49)	45.0	(133)	25.5

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 37.6 (p < .01)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Number of Health Conditions Interfering A Little or A Great Deal							
	0		1		2 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(131)	41.9	(27)	27.3	(28)	25.7	(186)	35.7
1 - 2	(105)	33.6	(34)	34.3	(45)	41.3	(184)	35.3
3 +	(77)	24.6	(38)	38.4	(36)	33.0	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 15.5 (p < .01)

(Source: Questions 6.3, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

3.5.4 The Relationship Between the Respondents' Frequency of Social Contact and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

The number of social contacts made by the respondent per month is related to the receipt of informal assistance with the activities of daily living, but not to the receipt of assistance from formal sources. Table 3.5.3 shows that respondents with twenty or more social contacts were more likely to have informal assistance on their activities. For example, thirty-two per cent (32%, N = 123) of respondents with twenty or more social contacts had three or more sources of assistance with the activities of daily living as compared to twenty per cent (19.7%, N = 28) of those with fewer than twenty social contacts per month.

TABLE 3.5.3

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Social Contacts Per Month

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Social Contacts Per Month					
	0 - 19		20+		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(75)	52.8	(204)	53.8	(279)	53.6
1	(25)	17.6	(84)	22.2	(109)	20.9
2 +	(42)	29.6	(91)	24.0	(133)	25.5

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 2.3 (p > .05)

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Social Contacts Per Month					
	0 - 19		20+		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(56)	39.4	(130)	34.3	(186)	35.7
1 - 2	(58)	40.9	(126)	33.2	(184)	35.3
3 +	(28)	19.7	(123)	32.5	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 8.2 (p < .05)

(Source: Questions 2.4, 2.6, 2.9, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

3.5.5 The Relationship Between the Number of Tenant Problems and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

As previously mentioned, tenant problems is measured by a number of indicators. The first is a measure of life stress (i.e., the number of life events which have occured within the past year, see Section 3.1.c). The second is a series of questions which ask if the respondent, their spouse or children had any of a number of problems over the last twelve months. The final indicator refers specifically to whether or not the respondent has difficulty finding enough money each month to buy food or pay rent.

i) Life Stress

Table 3.5.4 shows that respondents experiencing a greater number of life events within the past year were more likely than those with fewer occuring life events to receive both formal and informal sources of assistance for their activities of daily living. The data show, for example, that thirty-seven per cent (37.2%, N = 35) of respondents having four or more life events occur within the past year were receiving two or more sources of formal support with their activities of daily living, as compared to eighteen per cent (18.4%, N = 41) of those having none or only one life event occuring. Similarly, forty-seven per cent (46.8%, N = 44) of respondents with four or more occuring life events had assistance from informal sources of support with three or more of their activities of daily living as compared to twenty per cent (20.2%, N = 45) of those with none or one occuring life event.

TABLE 3.5.4

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Life Events Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Life Events 0 - 1		2 - 3		4 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(139)	62.3	(104)	51.0	(36)	38.3	(279)	53.6
1	(43)	19.3	(43)	21.1	(23)	24.5	(109)	20.9
2 +	(41)	18.4	(57)	27.9	(35)	37.2	(133)	25.5

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 18.4 (p < .01)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Number of Life Events 0 - 1		2 - 3		4 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(105)	47.1	(61)	29.9	(20)	21.3	(186)	35.7
1 - 2	(73)	32.7	(81)	39.7	(30)	31.9	(184)	35.3
3 +	(45)	20.2	(62)	30.4	(44)	46.8	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 33.7 (p < .01)

(Source: Questions 6.15, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

ii) Number of Problems Respondents Experienced by Children and Partners

Tables 3.5.5, 3.5.6 and 3.5.7 show that the receipt of assistance from both formal and informal sources is directly related to the number of problems had by the respondent, by their child/children and by their spouse/partner. These data indicate that tenants' families with greater numbers of problems received more assistance from both formal and informal sources than those with fewer problems. For example, Table 3.5.5 shows that almost forty per cent (39.4%, N = 71) of respondents with three or more problems were receiving assistance from two or more formal sources of support with the activities of daily living as compared to six per cent (5.5%, N = 7) of those with no problems. A second example is thirty-four per cent (34.1%, N = 30) of respondents whose children have three or more problems were receiving assistance from informal sources for three or more activities of daily living as compared to twenty-two per cent (21.9%, N = 55) of respondents with no child related problems reported.

iii) Extent of Difficulty Finding Enough Money

The receipt of assistance from informal sources of support is related to the extent of difficulty the respondent experiences finding enough money each month. For example, to buy food and pay rent. Table 3.5.8 shows that thirty-five per cent (35.3%, N = 43) of respondents who regularly find difficulty finding enough money received informal assistance from three or more sources of support with their activities of daily living as compared to

TABLE 3.5.5

Frequency of Formal and Informal Support Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Respondent's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Respondent's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(104)	81.3	(114)	53.5	(61)	33.9	(279)	53.6
1	(17)	13.3	(44)	20.7	(48)	26.7	(109)	20.9
2 +	(7)	5.5	(55)	25.8	(71)	39.4	(133)	25.5

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 71.6 (p < .01)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Number of Respondent's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(80)	62.5	(69)	32.4	(37)	20.6	(186)	35.7
1 - 2	(36)	28.1	(88)	41.3	(60)	33.3	(184)	35.3
3 +	(12)	9.4	(56)	26.3	(83)	46.1	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 77.9 (p <.01)

(Source: Questions 6.4, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

TABLE 3.5.6

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by Number of Child's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Child's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(167)	66.5	(85)	46.7	(27)	30.7	(279)	53.6
1	(45)	17.9	(43)	23.6	(21)	23.9	(109)	20.9
2 +	(39)	15.5	(54)	30.0	(40)	45.5	(133)	25.5

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 44.9 (p < .01)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Number of Child's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(114)	45.4	(50)	27.5	(22)	25.0	(186)	35.7
1 - 2	(82)	32.7	(66)	36.3	(36)	40.9	(184)	35.3
3 +	(55)	21.9	(66)	36.3	(30)	34.1	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 22.7 (p < .01)

(Source: Questions 6.12, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

TABLE 3.5.7

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents Reporting Difficulties With Activities of Daily Living by Number of Spouse's Problems Occuring Over the Last Twelve Months

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Number of Spouse's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(35)	74.5	(36)	54.6	(18)	40.0	(89)	56.3
1	(7)	14.9	(8)	12.1	(8)	17.8	(23)	14.6
2 +	(5)	10.6	(22)	33.3	(19)	42.2	(46)	29.1

Total N = 158
Chi-Square = 14.1 (p < .01)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Number of Spouse's Problems							
	None		1 - 2		3 +		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(23)	48.9	(25)	37.9	(9)	20.0	(57)	36.1
1 - 2	(16)	34.0	(19)	28.8	(15)	33.3	(50)	31.7
3 +	(8)	17.0	(22)	33.3	(21)	46.7	(51)	32.3

Total N = 158
Chi-Square = 12.0 (p > .01)

(Source: Questions 6.8, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

TABLE 3.5.8

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported
by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their
Activities of Daily Living by Extent of Difficulty
Finding Enough Money

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Extent of Difficulty Finding Enough Money							
	Never/ Rarely		Occasionally		Regularly		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(146)	59.4	(70)	46.4	(61)	50.0	(227)	53.4
1	(44)	17.9	(37)	24.5	(28)	23.0	(109)	21.0
2 +	(56)	22.8	(44)	29.1	(33)	27.1	(133)	25.6

Total N = 519
Chi-Square = 7.1 (p > .05)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Extent of Difficulty Finding Enough Money							
	Never/ Rarely		Occasionally		Regularly		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(104)	42.3	(50)	33.1	(31)	25.4	(185)	35.7
1 - 2	(87)	35.4	(48)	31.8	(48)	39.3	(183)	35.3
3 +	(55)	22.4	(53)	35.1	(43)	35.3	(151)	29.1

Total N = 519
Chi-Square = 15.3 (p < .01)

(Source: Questions 8.2, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

twenty-two per cent (22.4%, N = 55) of those who never or rarely had difficulty. The receipt of assistance from formal sources is not related to the respondents' difficulty finding enough money.

iv) The Relationship Between the Type of Tenant Problems and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

The analyses presented here addresses the question: Are respondents or their family members having specific types of problems within the last year, more likely to be receiving formal support for their activities of daily living. Similarily, how does the receipt of informal assistance vary by the type of problem?

Table 3.5.9 shows that, compared to respondents without problems, the percentage of respondents receiving formal assistance was greater for a number of the problems cited. Over eighty one per cent (81.8%, N=18) of respondents having trouble with the law had assistance from formal sources for their activities of daily living. Close to seventy per cent of respondents having trouble at work or school (69.2%, N = 27) or other problems with their health (66.2%, N = 88) received formal support. About sixty per cent of those having problems with depression (64.4%, N = 130), trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority (63.8%, N = 30), tension or disagreement with family or friends (60.8%, N = 113) or problems

TABLE 3.5.9

The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondent Over the Last Twelve Months

	Percentage Receiving Formal Assistance					Percentage Receiving Informal Assistance				
	Occurence of Problem					Occurence of Problem				
	Yes		No			Yes		No		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance
Problems with the budget	(151)	59.9	(91)	33.8	35.6 ($p < .01$)	(194)	77.0	(141)	52.4	34.2 ($p < .01$)
Difficulties with driving	(19)	63.3	(221)	45.9	3.5 ($p > .05$)	(23)	76.7	(306)	63.5	2.1 ($p > .05$)
Trouble at work or school	(27)	69.2	(213)	44.9	8.5 ($p < .01$)	(31)	79.5	(298)	62.9	4.3 ($p < .05$)
Depression	(130)	64.4	(112)	35.1	45.5 ($p < .01$)	(155)	76.7	(180)	56.4	22.2 ($p < .01$)
Other problems with health	(88)	66.2	(154)	39.7	27.9 ($p < .01$)	(106)	79.7	(229)	59.0	18.5 ($p < .01$)
Tension or disagreement with family or friends	(113)	60.8	(129)	38.6	23.5 ($p < .01$)	(142)	76.3	(192)	57.5	18.5 ($p < .01$)
Trouble with a superintendant, manager or housing authority	(30)	63.8	(212)	44.7	6.3 ($p < .01$)	(36)	76.6	(299)	63.1	3.4 ($p > .05$)
Accidental injury to self or someone else	(36)	58.1	(206)	44.9	3.8 ($p > .05$)	(47)	75.8	(288)	62.7	4.1 ($p < .05$)
Violent injury to self or someone else	(13)	65.0	(229)	45.7	2.9 ($p > .05$)	(16)	80.0	(319)	63.7	2.2 ($p > .05$)
Trouble with the law	(18)	81.8	(223)	44.8	11.6 ($p < .01$)	(16)	72.7	(319)	64.1	0.7 ($p > .05$)

Total N = 521

Row numbers do not sum to 100.0 per cent because formal assistance and informal assistance are taken from separate tables. Missing from this table are the percentages not receiving formal or informal assistance for each problem.

(Source: Questions 6.4, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

with the budget (59.9%) had assistance from formal sources of support for their activities of daily living.

Table 3.5.9 also shows that the percentages of respondents receiving informal support on the activities of daily living varied by the type of problems. Compared to those without problems, respondents more likely to have informal assistance are those having problems with his/her health (76.7%, N = 106), trouble at work or school (79.5%, N = 31), problems with the budget (77.0%, N = 194), depression (76.7%, N = 155), difficulties with driving (76.7%, N = 23), trouble with superintendent, manager or housing authority (76.6%, N = 36), accidental injury to his/herself or someone else (75.9%, N = 47) or tension or disagreement with family or friends (75.3%, N = 142).

Table 3.5.10 shows the percentages of respondents who received assistance on the activities of daily living by the types of problems experienced by their child or children over the last twelve months. These data indicate that respondents were more likely, than those whose children did not experience the problem, to receive formal assistance if their child/children had trouble with the law (75.0%, N = 21), trouble at work or school (72.2%, N = 70), depression (68.9%, N = 51), other problems with his/her health (64.8%, N = 66), tension or disagreement with family or friends (57.8%, N = 67), or accidental or violent injury to his/herself or someone else (58.1%, N = 36 and 65.0%, N = 13 respectively).

TABLE 3.5.10

The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondents' Child/Children Over the Last Twelve Months

	Percentage Receiving Formal Assistance					Percentage Receiving Informal Assistance				
	Occurence of Problem					Occurence of Problem				
	Yes		No			Yes		No		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance
Problems with the budget	(25)	55.5	(217)	45.6	1.6 (p > .05)	(40)	88.9	(295)	62.0	13.0 (p < .01)
Difficulties with driving	(3)	37.5	(239)	46.6	0.3 (p > .05)	(7)	87.5	(328)	63.9	1.9 (p > .05)
Trouble at work or school	(70)	72.2	(172)	40.6	31.7 (p < .01)	(72)	74.2	(263)	62.0	5.1 (p < .05)
Depression	(51)	68.9	(189)	42.5	17.9 (p < .01)	(59)	79.7	(275)	61.8	8.9 (p < .01)
Other problems with health	(66)	64.7	(176)	42.0	17.0 (p < .01)	(75)	73.5	(260)	62.1	4.7 (p < .05)
Tension or disagreement with family or friends	(67)	57.8	(175)	43.3	7.6 (p < .01)	(88)	75.9	(246)	60.9	8.8 (p < .01)
Trouble with a superintendant, manager or housing authority	(7)	63.6	(235)	46.1	1.3 (p > .05)	(5)	45.5	(330)	64.7	1.7 (p > .05)
Accidental injury to self or someone else	(41)	57.7	(201)	44.7	4.2 (p < .05)	(48)	67.6	(287)	63.8	0.4 (p > .05)
Violent injury to self or someone else	(12)	70.6	(230)	45.6	4.1 (p < .05)	(13)	76.5	(322)	63.9	1.1 (p > .05)
Trouble with the law	(21)	75.0	(221)	44.8	9.7 (p < .01)	(18)	64.3	(317)	64.3	0.0 (p > .05)

Total N = 521

Row numbers do not sum to 100.0 per cent because formal assistance and informal assistance are taken from separate tables. Missing from this table are the percentages not receiving formal or informal assistance for each problem.

(Source: Questions 6.12, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

TABLE 3.5.11

The Receipt of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Their Activities of Daily Living by the Type of Problems Experienced by the Respondents' Spouse Over the Last Twelve Months

	Percentage Receiving Formal Assistance					Percentage Receiving Informal Assistance				
	Occurence of Problem					Occurence of Problem				
	Yes		No			Yes		No		
	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance	(N)	%	(N)	%	X^2 Significance
Problems with the budget	(44)	59.5	(25)	29.8	14.1 ($p < .01$)	(55)	74.3	(46)	54.8	6.5 ($p < .01$)
Difficulties with driving	(3)	33.3	(66)	44.3	0.4 ($p > .05$)	(5)	55.6	(96)	64.1	0.3 ($p > .05$)
Trouble at work or school	(8)	72.7	(61)	41.5	4.1 ($p < .05$)	(10)	91.0	(91)	61.9	3.7 ($p > .05$)
Depression	(28)	56.0	(41)	38.0	4.5 ($p < .05$)	(39)	78.0	(62)	57.4	6.3 ($p < .05$)
Other problems with health	(22)	48.9	(47)	41.6	0.7 ($p > .05$)	(35)	77.7	(66)	58.4	5.2 ($p < .05$)
Tension or disagreement with family or friends	(25)	61.0	(44)	37.6	6.7 ($p < .01$)	(31)	75.6	(70)	59.8	3.3 ($p > .05$)
Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	(7)	70.0	(62)	41.9	3.0 ($p > .05$)	(7)	77.8	(94)	63.5	0.2 ($p > .05$)
Accidental injury to self or someone else	(7)	38.9	(62)	44.3	0.2 ($p >.05$)	(12)	66.7	(89)	63.6	0.1 ($p > .05$)
Violent injury to self or someone else	(4)	80.0	(65)	42.5	2.8 ($p > .05$)	(4)	80.0	(97)	63.4	0.6 ($p > .05$)
Trouble with the law	(5)	55.6	(64)	43.0	0.5 ($p > .05$)	(8)	88.9	(93)	62.4	2.6 ($p > .05$)

Total N = 158

Row numbers do not sum to 100.0 per cent because formal assistance and informal assistance are taken from separate tables. Missing from this table are the percentages not receiving formal or informal assistance for each problem.

(Source: Questions 6.8, 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

Also, respondents were more likely to receive informal assistance with the activities of daily living if their child/children had problems with the budget (88.9%, N = 40), depression (79.7%, N = 59), tension or disagreement with family or friends (75.9%, N = 88), difficulties at work or school (74.2%, N = 72) or other problems with his/her health (73.5%, N = 75).

Finally, Table 3.5.11 shows the percentages of respondents who received assistance with the activities of daily living by the types of problems experienced by their spouse/friend over the last twelve months. The data illustrates that, as compared to respondents whose spouse/friend did not have the problem, respondents were more likely to have assistance from formal sources of support for their activities of daily living if their spouse/friend had trouble at work or school (72.7%, N = 8), tension or disagreement with family or friends (61.0%, N = 25), problems with the budget (59.5%, N = 44), or depression (56.0%, N = 28). Also, assistance from informal sources of support was greater for respondents whose spouse/friend suffered from depression (78.0%, N = 39), tension or disagreement with family or friends (75.6%, N = 31) or problems with the budget (74.3%, N = 55).

3.5.6 The Relationship Between Municipality and the Receipt of Assistance from Formal and Informal Sources of Support with Activities of Daily Living

As seen in Chapter 2, there are important differences in the types of formal services available in the municipalities in this survey. As well, the agency respondents indicate important differences in the use of these services when available by municipality. To what extent, then, does the type of assistance received vary by municipality.

Table 3.5.12 (total columns) shows the percentages of family public housing respondents who received help from formal and informal sources of assistance by municipality and indicates that the percentage receiving formal assistance varies by municipality. Seventy-five per cent (75.5%, N = 65) of the family respondents in Sudbury did not receive assistance from formal sources of support as compared to thirty-three per cent (32.9%, N = 24) in London, and Belleville (33.3%, N = 6) and thirty-nine per cent (38.5%, N = 5) of respondents in Owen Sound.

The data in Table 3.5.12 also indicates that respondents in Sudbury (79.1%, N = 68 with no informal support) and Peterborough (48.3%, N = 14 with no informal support) were less likely to receive assistance from informal sources for their activities of daily living. Municipalities where respondents were more likely to receive assistance from informal supports on two or more activities of daily living include Owen Sound (92.3%, N = 12), Metropolitan Toronto (59.2%, N = 158) and Belleville (55.6%, N = 10).

TABLE 3.5.12

Frequency of Formal and Informal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents
With Their Activities of Daily Living by Municipality

Frequency of Formal Assistance	Total		Municipality													
			Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(279)	53.6	(6)	33.3	(24)	32.9	(147)	55.1	(5)	38.5	(13)	44.8	(19)	54.3	(65)	75.6
1	(109)	20.9	(6)	33.3	(22)	30.1	(56)	21.0	(2)	15.4	(8)	27.6	(4)	11.4	(11)	12.8
2 +	(133)	25.5	(6)	33.3	(27)	37.0	(64)	24.0	(6)	46.2	(8)	27.6	(12)	34.3	(10)	11.6

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 39.6 (p < .000)

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Total		Municipality													
			Belleville		London		Metro Toronto		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
None	(186)	35.7	(4)	22.2	(25)	34.3	(65)	24.3	(0)	0.0	(14)	48.3	(10)	28.6	(68)	79.1
1	(92)	17.7	(4)	22.2	(20)	27.4	(44)	16.5	(1)	7.7	(4)	13.8	(8)	22.9	(11)	12.8
2 +	(243)	46.6	(10)	55.6	(28)	38.4	(158)	59.2	(12)	92.3	(11)	37.9	(17)	48.6	(7)	8.1

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 113.4 (p < .000)

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2, ... 3.10)

3.5.7 The Relationship Between the Receipt of Assistance From Formal and Informal Sources of Support with the Activities of Daily Living

Do respondents receive assistance from both formal and informal sources of support with activities of daily living or does the receipt of assistance tend to be from only one source or the other? The data in Table 3.5.13 provides an answer to the above question. It shows that the receipt of assistance tends to be additive, that is respondents who were receiving two or more formal sources of assistance were more likely to also be receiving three or more informal sources of assistance with the activities of daily living than were respondents with no assistance from formal sources (36.1%, N = 48 vs. 21.9%, N = 61 respectively).

TABLE 3.5.13

Frequency of Formal Assistance Reported by Family Public Housing Respondents With Activities of Daily Living by the Frequency of Informal Assistance Reported With Activities of Daily Living

Frequency of Informal Assistance	Frequency of Formal Assistance							
	None		1		2+		Total	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
None	(125)	44.8	(33)	30.3	(28)	21.1	(186)	35.7
1-2	(93)	33.3	(34)	31.2	(57)	42.9	(184)	35.3
3+	(61)	21.9	(42)	38.5	(48)	36.1	(151)	29.0

Total N = 521
Chi-Square = 29.0 (p < .01)
Pearson R = .21

(Source: Questions 3.1, 3.2 ... 3.10)

3.6 Sufficient Help With the Activities of Daily Living

This section considers the extent to which family public housing tenants who experience difficulties with the activities of daily living receive the help they indicate they need. Three measures of "sufficient" help are used. For each activity, respondents were asked if the help they received was "enough help" and "the right kind of help". They were also asked, "without help would you have been able to get by".

Most respondents who were receiving help indicated they were receiving both "enough" and the "right kind of help" (see Table 3.6.1). However, about one-third (31.9%, N = 38) of respondents receiving help with making ends meet did not think the help they received was "enough". Around nineteen per cent (19.4%, N = 24) of those receiving assistance with children's behavioural problems and about sixteen per cent (16.5%, N = 13) of those receiving assistance with child rearing and parenting or adult personal problems (15.0%, N = 22) do not have "enough" help.

Table 3.6.2 illustrates the variation by activity in the respondent's perceived need for assistance. Over sixty per cent of respondents receiving assistance with adult personal problems or making ends meet indicate they would not be able to get by or they would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty" without this assistance. Around fifty per cent of respondents receiving assistance with children's behavioural problems, getting information or child care indicate that without help they

TABLE 3.6.1

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Enough Help, Right Kind of Help

Activities of Daily Living	Enough Help						Right Kind of Help					
	Yes		No		Total		Yes		No		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(181)	89.2	(22)	10.8	(203)	100.0	(192)	95.0	(10)	5.0	(202)	100.0
Child Care	(137)	89.0	(17)	11.0	(154)	100.0	(146)	94.8	(8)	5.2	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(125)	85.0	(22)	15.0	(147)	100.0	(130)	89.0	(16)	11.0	(146)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(120)	93.0	(9)	7.0	(129)	100.0	(124)	96.9	(4)	3.1	(128)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problems	(100)	80.6	(24)	19.4	(124)	100.0	(107)	87.7	(15)	12.3	(122)	100.0
Making Ends Meet	(81)	68.1	(38)	31.9	(119)	100.0	(108)	90.8	(11)	9.2	(119)	100.0
Transporation	(96)	91.4	(9)	8.6	(105)	100.0	(104)	99.0	(1)	1.0	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for Children	(83)	93.3	(6)	6.7	(89)	100.0	(88)	98.9	(1)	1.1	(89)	100.0
Getting Information	(72)	91.1	(7)	8.9	(79)	100.0	(74)	93.7	(5)	6.3	(79)	100.0
Child Rearing and Parenting	(66)	83.5	(13)	16.5	(79)	100.0	(72)	93.5	(5)	6.5	(77)	100.0

TABLE 3.6.2

Family Public Housing Respondents, Percentage With Difficulties Who Are Receiving Help With the Activities of Daily Living by Ability to Get By

Activities of Daily Living	Ability To Get By									
	With No Difficulty		A Little Difficulty		A Lot Of Difficulty		Not At All		Total	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(42)	20.8	(72)	35.6	(75)	37.1	(13)	6.4	(202)	100.0
Child Care	(31)	20.1	(52)	33.8	(51)	33.1	(20)	13.0	(154)	100.0
Adult Personal Problems	(10)	6.8	(42)	28.6	(66)	44.9	(29)	19.7	(147)	100.0
Heavy Cleaning	(31)	24.2	(43)	33.6	(37)	28.9	(17)	13.3	(128)	100.0
Children's Behaviour Problems	(13)	10.6	(44)	35.8	(57)	46.3	(9)	7.3	(123)	100.0
Making Ends Meet	(7)	5.9	(36)	30.3	(47)	39.5	(29)	24.4	(119)	100.0
Transportation	(12)	11.4	(41)	39.0	(39)	37.1	(13)	12.4	(105)	100.0
Providing Recreation for Children	(19)	21.3	(43)	48.3	(22)	24.7	(5)	5.6	(89)	100.0
Getting Information	(9)	11.4	(28)	35.4	(33)	41.8	(9)	11.4	(79)	100.0
Child Rearing and Parenting	(10)	12.8	(34)	43.6	(22)	28.2	(12)	15.4	(78)	100.0

NOTE: total percentages may not sum to 100.0 per cent due to rounding errors.

would not be able to get by or they could only get by with a lot of difficulty. About forty per cent of the family members surveyed indicate essential help on activities such as grocery shopping, heavy cleaning, and child rearing and parenting.

Are families who reported difficulties with the activities of daily living receiving assistance? The data indicate that the proportion of respondents who did not receive assistance with their difficulties varies by the type of difficulty. Table 3.6.3 shows that:

28.9%	239	of respondents having difficulties with grocery shopping received assistance
14.9%	154	of respondents having difficulties with child care received assistance
43.6%	257	of respondents with adult personal problems received assistance
41.8%	177	of respondents having difficulties with heavy cleaning received assistance
45.9%	222	of respondents having difficulties with children's behavioural problems received assistance
67.7%	362	of respondents having difficulties making ends meet received assistance
31.7%	142	of respondents having difficulties with transportation received assistance
50.0%	152	of respondents having difficulties providing recreation for children received assistance
44.5%	128	of respondents having difficulties getting information received assistance
56.3%	167	of respondents having difficulties with child rearing and parenting received assistance

TABLE 3.6.3

Assistance Received and Requests for Help by Family Public Housing Respondents Who Reported Difficulties With the Activities of Daily Living and Who Did Not Receive Help

	(A)	(B)		(C)		(D)		(E)		(F)	
	- - - - - Total Difficulties - - - - -					- - - - - No Assistance Received - - - - -					
	Total With Difficulties	Received Assistance		No Assistance Received		Requested Help		No Request For Help		Refusals or Missing	
Activities of Daily Living	(N)	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
Grocery Shopping	(239)	(170)	71.1	(69)	28.9	(49)	20.5	(19)	7.9	(1)	0.4
Child Care	(154)	(131)	85.1	(23)	14.9	(18)	11.7	(3)	1.9	(2)	1.3
Adult Personal Problems	(257)	(145)	56.4	(112)	43.6	(62)	24.1	(46)	18.0	(4)	1.5
Heavy Cleaning	(177)	(103)	58.2	(74)	41.8	(40)	22.6	(33)	18.6	(1)	0.6
Children's Behavioural Problems	(222)	(120)	54.1	(102)	45.9	(36)	16.2	(61)	27.5	(5)	1.8
Making Ends Meet	(362)	(117)	32.3	(245)	67.7	(159)	43.9	(78)	21.5	(8)	2.3
Transportation	(142)	(97)	68.3	(45)	31.7	(30)	21.1	(14)	9.9	(1)	0.7
Providing Recreation for Children	(152)	(76)	50.0	(76)	50.0	(59)	38.8	(13)	8.5	(4)	2.6
Getting Information	(128)	(71)	55.5	(57)	44.5	(45)	35.2	(11)	8.6	(1)	0.8
Child Rearing and Parenting	(167)	(73)	43.7	(94)	56.3	(45)	26.9	(48)	28.7	(1)	0.6

CHAPTER 4: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The purpose of the study is to identify the extent to which families in public housing have difficulties with the activities of daily living and the kinds of supports they use -- informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal services from community agencies.

This study came into focus as a direct spinoff from a study on support services for senior citizen public housing tenants which was being planned by the Ministry of Housing along with the assistance of a number of other ministries or agencies.

The decision to study sources of support to family public housing tenants was taken for two reasons. The first was the growing concern for the problems faced by many families in public housing, including lack of adequate income, single parent families, lack of job skills, emotional and behavioural problems, security problems and conflict with neighbours. The second reason concerns the apparent increase in the dependence by family tenants on the use of community services.

The study involved two separate surveys: the first was a face-to-face interview with 521 family public housing tenants; the second was a mailed survey to 136 service providers and agencies. Both surveys afforded higher than average response rates -- 83.2% and 72.8% respectively.

In total, 11 communities were selected for study, including Belleville, Etobicoke, London, North York, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines, Scarborough, Sudbury, Toronto, and York.

A number of objectives guided the formation of the study. Chapter 4 presents a summary of the results for each of these objectives.

Summary of Findings from the Agency Survey

Objective 1: Description of the neighbourhoods where housing projects are located.

Most of the families' housing projects were located in lower and middle income residential neighbourhoods. Just over one-third of the projects were situated in residential areas with predominantly single family homes.

Although transportation facilities were rated very highly (very good or excellent) by most service providers who responded to the survey, a number of other neighbourhood aspects were not rated as highly, including "safety from crime or violence, safe to go out at night, safe for children and parks and playgrounds".

Family housing projects in the sample appeared to be very accessible in terms of walking distance or public transit, and facilities such as the corner store, play areas for older children, restaurants, a junior school, playgrounds for young children, a drug store and parks.

Objective 2: Description of the service providers' perceptions of the tenants' problems.

There was concensus among the service providers on the major problems faced by the family tenants. The most frequently mentioned problems were lack of employment for youth and parents, lack of employment skills, inadequate incomes and no motivation to work.

Objective 3: Description of the service providers' perceptions of the services available to the tenants.

Almost all respondents reported that services such as the public health nurse, the police, Children's Aid Society, family benefits workers, educational upgrading and family counselling were available to tenants. The agency respondents seemed unaware of some of the other services or agencies that provide services to public housing tenants in their community. As many as one-third were not aware of whether after school child care or other income maintenance services were available.

Objective 4: Description of the possible reasons why some tenants did not use the services they need.

There were a variety of reasons given by service providers as to their perceptions of why families in public housing did not use the services they needed. The three main reasons appeared to be "lack of motivation", "lack of information" and "lack of recognition of needs" on the part of the tenants themselves.

"Client unawareness", as well as "lack of client motivation" were foremost in a list of problems that service providers reported having when dealing with tenants in public housing.

Objective 5: Description of the service providers' perceptions of their role in the housing projects.

The agency respondents perceived a need for improved communication between housing project staff and outside agencies; tenants and service providers as a whole; and among agencies themselves. In exactly one-half of the housing projects for families, agency respondents reported never meeting with housing project staff regarding their service delivery. More than one-half said they never conferred with other agencies about their cases. In over one-third of the projects, respondents felt that they did not find out about tenant problems until a crisis occurred.

Most of the service providers felt than an on-site, multi-service facility would improve service delivery to public housing tenants in their community.

Summary of Findings from the Tenant Survey

Objective 1: Description of family public housing tenants with respect to their background characteristics, health status, tenant problems and social networks.

The respondents ranged in age from 18 to over 60 years of age. Forty-two per cent of the respondents were between the ages of 30 - 39, and twenty-four per cent of the respondents were under the age of 29. The vast majority of the respondents were women. Two-thirds of the respondents were born in Canada; fifteen per cent of the respondents were born in the West Indies and; about seventeen per cent of the respondents were born elsewhere. Of those foreign born, about one-quarter came to Canada before the 1970s and two-thirds immigrated to Canada during the 1970s. Close to ninety per cent of the respondents used English all or most of the time.

Very few of the respondents had completed high school. Over two-thirds of the family tenants surveyed did not work outside the home.

Seventy per cent of the respondents headed single parent families. Three person households were the most prevalent, followed by four person households. One-quarter of the families had one child; four-fifths of the families had two children; another quarter of the families had three children and; one -in-ten families had four or more children. The families surveyed had mainly school-aged children. Only about one-quarter of the respondents have pre-school children, and over one-half have teenage children. Eight-out-of-ten children mentioned by the respondents are in school.

The families' household monthly income varied from less than $500 per month to over $1200 per month, with over one-half of the respondents having incomes in the $500 - $799 range. Low incomes were a problem for respondents; almost one-quarter indicated regular difficulty finding enough money each month to buy food or pay rent, for example, and another quarter indicated occasional money problems. The major source of income for respondents, according to data from the OFIS file, was the family benefits allowance, followed by full-time employment and the general welfare allowance.

The number of family health conditions reported by the respondents ranged from 0 to 6, with a mean of 1.0. Over one-half of the respondents reported a family health condition. Of those with one or more health conditions in their household, about eighty per cent indicated that these health conditions interfered with daily activities. Of those reporting family health conditions, about forty per cent of the health problems were experienced by the respondent, fourteen per cent were a spouse's health problem and around forty-five per cent were health problems experienced by the respondent's children. While a very wide range of health problems were mentioned, the most common appear to be asthma, emphysema or chronic bronchitis, back problems, high blood pressure, heart trouble or the effects of a stroke, and ear, nose or throat conditions.

In a series of questions, respondents were asked if they, their spouse/partner (if applicable) or any of their children had any of a number of eleven problems over the last twelve months. The number of problems reported range from 0 to 10 with averages of 2.0, 1.8, and 1.1 for the repondent, his/her spouse and any of his/her children respectively. The average number of problems reported for all family members was 3.8. The most prevalent problems were with the budget, depression, tension or disagreement with family or friends, problems with health, and accidental injury to themselves or someone else. As well, one-in-five of the respondents indicated that their children were having trouble at work or school. The number of problems were greater for children in single parent families.

Turning now to life stress, one common way of measuring stress is to assess the number of life events which have occurred within a specified period of time. Researchers have measured the comparative impact of different life events on individuals who have actually experienced them and had these people identify those which had the greatest impact on peoples' lives. In this study, respondents were given a list of these life events and asked to indicate those which "happened to you in the last twelve months". The number of life events experienced by respondents ranged from 0 to 8, with an average of 2.1. In order of prevalence, the most common events were financial problems, loss of job or being unemployed, the death or serious illness of someone dear, someone moved out of your home, a serious illness, a separation or started work or changed jobs.

Over one-third of the respondents had children living elsewhere; eighty per cent of respondents had relatives other than children and eighty per cent of respondents reported friends. About one-quarter of respondents spoke on the phone with children living elsewhere at least once a week and; over one-half of the respondents talked on the phone at least once a week with a relative or friend.

Visiting tends to be less frequent than telephone contact. Visiting with friends and other relatives appears to be fairly frequent, with one-quarter to one-third of family respondents either visiting in a friend's or relative's home, or having a friend or relative visit in their home once a week or more.

Over the period of a month, five per cent of respondents had no social contacts. Eleven per cent of respondents had fewer than ten social contacts; forty-six per cent of those surveyed had 20 - 49 contacts and; about one-quarter of the family respondents had fifty or more contacts per month.

Respondents were asked to indicate if they had children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend within the local community or outside the community. The data indicates that the proportion of respondents reporting children, relatives or friends on whom they could depend in the same city or community was 24.8 per cent, 59.7 per cent and 75.9 per cent respectively. About nine per cent of the respondents reported that they had no children or relatives or friends on whom they could depend in the local community.

Respondents were asked to identify whom they would most likely turn to for a series of eight problems. While it varies from problem to problem, respondents said they would be more likely to turn to informal sources (i.e., relatives, neighbours and friends) of support than formal sources if they needed help for problems they may encounter.

Objective 2: Description of the difficulties with activities of daily living reported by family public housing tenants.

The average number of difficulties with activities of daily living reported by the housing respondents was 3.8. Almost ninety per cent of respondents reported at least one difficulty. Seventy per cent of the respondents had difficulties managing the family budget and making ends meet. Nearly one-half of respondents had problems or crises for themselves or other adult family members, difficulties shopping for groceries and problems dealing with their child/children's emotional and behavioural problems. One-third of the family respondents had difficulty with child rearing and parenting generally. Of those with children under 12, over forty per cent had difficulty providing regular or occasional child care and providing for recreation and other leisure activities. One-third of the respondents reported difficulties with heavy cleaning and; one-quarter of those surveyed reported difficulties getting around the community on their own and getting information about government or community programs or services or any other help they might need.

Objective 3: Description of the type of, frequency and arrangement for assistance received by family public housing tenants with activities of daily living.

A series of questions in the family public housing survey was designed to measure the extent to which family respondents were receiving assistance with the activities of daily living within the past year. The findings indicate that the proportion of respondents receiving assistance varies by activity. About forty per cent of respondents had assistance for grocery shopping and thirty per cent of respondents received help for child care and adult personal problems. One-quarter of family respondents received help with heavy cleaning and childrens' behavioural problems. Around one-fifth of respondents received assistance making ends meet and with transportation. And, fifteen per cent of those surveyed had help with providing recreation for their children, getting information and child rearing and parenting.

The most frequent assistance received was for heavy cleaning, providing recreation for children and child rearing and parenting. For these activities, the majority of respondents had help at least once, and often several times a week. Assistance for grocery shopping, child care, adult personal problems, children's behavioural problems, making ends meet and transportation was received on a less frequent basis -- typically once or twice a month. Assistance with getting information was received less frequently than once a month.

The length of time assistance was received varied across activities from less than six months to over four years. It is noteworthy that for heavy cleaning and grocery shopping about forty per cent of those receiving help had this assistance for more than four years. And, about one-quarter of respondents had help with child care, adult personal problems and transportation for four years or more. Most of the family respondents receiving assistance had help on a regular and on-going basis.

Arrangements for assistance tended to be made largely by the respondents themselves. Arrangements were sometimes made by physicians for adult personal problems and children's behavioural problems and problems with child rearing and parenting.

Respondents were asked if in the past year they or any family member had ever received help from a list of twenty-six various community services such as health services, school social workers, homemaker service and many others. On average, family respondents and/or their family members used 2.8 services within the past year. Eighty-seven per cent of the respondents and/or their family members used at least one service within the last year. Many reported contact with multiple services. For example, over one-half of the respondents and their family members used three or more services of the 26 services listed.

The most frequently used services in the past year were family benefits workers (41.1%), health services (40.3%), other income maintenance (24.0%), police (24.0%), housing project staff including maintenance (21.9%), educational upgrading programs (16.1%), recreational community drop-in centres (15.5%), job counselling (12.7%), counselling on family law matters (11.3%), pre-school child day care programs (10.9%), and Children's Aid Society (10.6%).

Objective 4: Description of the sources of assistance used by family public housing tenants with activities of daily living.

Support services may come from a diverse number of sources which, for purposes of this survey, have been classed as either informal supports (i.e., children, other family, friends or neighbours) or formal supports (i.e., community agency, hired services, church, club or organization, etc.). Of all the assistance provided, the most frequent providers of assistance, in descending order, were community agencies, family other than children, friends or neighbours, children, spouse and paid help. Note that about two-thirds of all assistance received by family respondents was provided by informal sources of support.

There were important variations in the sources of support across activities. On the other hand, assistance with getting information, children's behavioural problems, and heavy cleaning came mainly from formal sources of assistance. On the other hand, assistance with heavy cleaning, grocery shopping, transportation and child care came mainly from informal sources. Help with making ends meet and assistance with child rearing and parenting came about equally from both informal and formal sources.

Objective 5: Description of the factors which relate to the receipt of informal and formal assistance.

A measure of the use of informal assistance was created by summing help received by children, other family, friends and neighbours across the ten activities of daily living. Similarly, a measure of the use of formal assistance was created by summing help from community agencies, paid help and other formal sources across the ten activities of daily living. An analysis of the data shows that the receipt of assistance -- whether from informal or formal sources -- was not related to the respondents' age, birthplace, family type, number of children in the home, ages of these children, level of education, employment status, total household monthly income, or their primary source of income.

The number of health conditions that interfere with everyday activities was related to the receipt of assistance from both formal and informal sources of support. Respondents and their families with two or more interfering health conditions were more likely to receive assistance from both formal and informal sources for their difficulties with activities of daily living than were those without interfering health conditions.

The number of social contacts made by the respondent per month was related to the receipt of informal assistance with the activities of daily living, but not to the receipt of assistance from formal sources. Respondents with twenty or more social contacts were more likely to have informal assistance on their activities.

Tenant problems were measured by a number of indicators. These were a measure of life stress, a series of questions which ask if the respondent, their spouse or children had any of a number of problems over the last twelve months, and a measure of whether or not the respondent had difficulty finding enough money each month to buy food or pay rent.

The receipt of both formal and informal assistance is significantly related to each of these measures. Specifically, respondents experiencing a greater number of life events within the past year were more likely than those with fewer occuring life events to receive support from formal and informal sources of assistance for their activities of daily living. Also, tenants' families with greater numbers of problems received more assistance from both formal and informal sources than those with fewer problems.

Compared to respondents without problems, the percentage of respondents receiving formal and informal assistance was greater for a number of the problems cited. Respondents were more likely to receive formal assistance if they were having trouble with the law, trouble at work or school, other problems with their health, problems with depression, trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority, tension or disagreement with family or friends, or problems with the budget.

Compared to those without problems, respondents more likely to have informal assistance were those having problems with his/her health, trouble at work or school, problems with the budget, depression, difficulties with driving, trouble with superintendent, manager or housing authority, accidental injury to his/herself or someone else or tension or disagreement with family or friends.

The percentages of respondents who received assistance on activities of daily living varied by the types of problems experienced by their child or children over the last twelve months. Respondents were more likely, than those whose children did not experience the problem, to receive formal assistance if their child/children had trouble with the law, trouble at work or school, depression, other problems with his/her health, tension or disagreement with family or friends, or accidental or violent injury to his/herself or someone else.

Also, respondents were more likely to receive informal assistance with the activities of daily living if their child/children had problems with the budget , depression, tension or disagreement with family or friends, difficulties at work or school or other problems with his/her health. And, compared to respondents whose spouse/friend did not have the problem, respondents were more likely to have assistance from formal sources of support for their activities of daily living if their spouse/friend had trouble at work or school, tension or disagreement with family or friends, problems with the budget, or depression. Also, assistance from informal sources of support was greater for respondents whose spouse/friend suffered from depression, tension or disagreement with family or friends or problems with the budget.

The analysis continued with a look at how the receipt of formal and informal assistance with activities of daily living varied by municipality of residence. Receipt of formal assistance was highest in London, Belleville and Owen Sound and lowest in Sudbury. Receipt of informal assistance was highest in Owen Sound, Toronto and Belleville and lowest in Sudbury and Peterborough.

Finally, the report looks at the relationship of the receipt of formal and informal assistance with the activities of daily living. The receipt of assistance tends to be additive, for example, respondents who were receiving two or more formal sources of assistance were more also likely to also be receiving three or more informal sources of assistance with the activities of daily living than were respondents with no assistance from formal sources.

Objective 6: Description of the extent to which family public housing tenants are receiving the help they indicate they need with the activities of daily living.

Most respondents who were receiving help indicated they were receiving both "enough" and "the right kind of help". However, about one-third of respondents receiving help with making ends meet did not think the help they received was "enough". Around nineteen per cent of those receiving assistance with children's behavioural problems and about sixteen per cent of those receiving assistance with child rearing and parenting or adult personal problems indicated they did not have "enough" help.

The majority of respondents receiving assistance indicated that it was essential (i.e., without the help they would not be able to get by or they could only get by with a lot of difficulty). This included sixty per cent of respondents receiving assistance with adult personal problems or making ends meet, fifty per cent of respondents receiving assistance with children's behavioural problems, getting information, and child care and forty per cent of family members receiving assistance with activities such as grocery shopping, heavy cleaning, and child rearing and parenting.

The number of respondents who experienced difficulties and were not receiving assistance were:

28.9% of 239	respondents with difficulties grocery shopping
14.9% of 154	respondents with difficulties with child care
43.6% of 257	respondents with adult personal problems
41.8% of 177	respondents with difficulties with heavy cleaning
45.9% of 222	respondents with difficulties with children's behavioural problems
67.7% of 362	respondents with difficulties making ends meet
31.7% of 142	respondents with difficulties with transportation
50.0% of 152	respondents with difficulties providing recreation for children
44.5% of 128	respondents with difficulties getting information

56.3% of 167 respondents with difficulties child rearing and parenting

When the respondents who reported difficulties but no assistance were asked if they could use help, the areas of greatest perceived need were making ends meet, providing recreation for children, getting information, child rearing and parenting, and adult personal problems.

In Conclusion

The survey of families in public housing is the first of its kind to be conducted among public housing tenants in Ontario. It indicates the extent to which family public housing respondents have difficulties with activities of daily living and what kinds of support tenants use -- whether informal assistance from family, friends and neighbours and/or formal assistance from community services.

To date, very little research has been done on the need for and use of supports among public housing tenants in Ontario. No similar survey of the general population exists to use as a benchmark for comparison to the survey of public housing families.

Tenants in public housing are chosen on the basis of "greatest need". As such, the tenants tend to be those with many problems. This study has identified the extent of the problems, related to the activities of daily living, examined the use of supports by tenants and identified the need for support or help.

The analyses completed here has highlighted some of the important findings in this research, however, no attempts have been made to interpret the findings, nor to discuss the social policy implications of the findings. These tasks are left to the social policy planners of related government ministries and other interested agencies and it is hoped that other researchers will take up the challenge of exploring the data set in more depth.

REFERENCES

Brim, O.G. Jr.
1980 "Types of Life Events" *Journal of Social Issues*, 36, pp. 148-157.

Brown, K., C.K. Davis, M.A. Denton & A. Martin Matthews
1982 "A Crisis assessment technique for the evaluation of Life Events: Transition to Retirement as an Example". *Canadian Journal on Aging*, Vol. 1, Nos. 3 & 4: 28-39.

Davis, C.
1985 *"The Highland-Stirling Neighbourhood Project: Evaluating Program Effects in the Mental Health Domain - A followup Study"*. Report prepared for Lutherwood, Waterloo.

Goldblatt, Svlvia
1965 *Social Integration or Isolation Among Residents of Public Housing Projects.* Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto.

APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1: A PROFILE OF THE USE OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY FAMILY PUBLIC HOUSING RESPONDENTS: THE FREQUENCY OF ASSISTANCE; LENGTH OF TIME SERVICE WAS USED; DURATION OF ASSISTANCE AND WHETHER THE ASSISTANCE MET THE PERCEIVED NEED

A.1.0 Introduction

There are many formal services available to respondents and their families in public housing and, as seen in Chapter 3, a sizeable proportion of respondents made use of these services. This appendix will profile those services which were used by more than five per cent of respondents or their family members in public housing.

A.1.1 Health Services

In the past year, forty per cent (40.3%, N = 210) of families received assistance from health services, excluding routine visits to a physician (see Table A.1.1). This assistance was provided to either a child (51.4%, N = 108) or to the respondent (42.4%, N = 89). The health services provided included surgery or treatment (46.6%, N = 98), a hospital emergency (17.6%, N = 37) or out-patient care (6.6%, N = 14) as well as other related kinds of help (29.0%, N = 61).

Health services were largely received outside the respondent's home or housing project (92.4%, N = 194), and tended to occur on an infrequent basis. For example, fifty-six per cent of families (55.8%, N = 116) received health services less than once a month. Three-quarters (75.2%, N = 158) of the families had received this help for less than one year. Health services were provided at one time only (26.7%, N = 56) or on a time-limited basis (36.2%, N = 76) during the past year.

Over ninety per cent of respondents described the receipt of health services as either "enough help" (91.4%, N = 191) or the "right kind of help" (91.9%, N = 193). Health services were arranged either through a physician (47.6%, N = 100) or by the respondents themselves (39.0%, N = 82). Without help from health services, twenty-four per cent (23.8%, N = 50) of those receiving this service would not "be able to get by", and a further forty-two per cent (42.4%, N = 89) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.1

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM HEALTH SERVICES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from health services?		
Yes	210	40.3
No	311	59.7
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	89	42.4
Spouse/Housemate	11	5.2
Child	108	51.4
Other	2	1.0
	Total N = 210	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Surgery, treatment	98	46.6
Hospital emergency	37	17.6
Outpatient Care	14	6.6
Other	61	29.0
	Total N = 210	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	13	6.2
In Building/Project	3	1.4
Out of Building/Project	194	92.4
	Total N = 210	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	20	9.6
2 or 3 times a week	4	1.9
Once a week	11	5.3
1 to 3 times a month	37	17.8
Less than once a month	116	55.8
Other	20	9.6
	Total N = 208	

TABLE A.1.1 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	70	33.3
Less than 6 months	67	31.9
6 months to one year	21	10.0
More than one to two years	19	9.0
More than two to three years	8	3.8
More than three to four years	5	2.4
Over four years	20	9.5
	Total N = 210	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	56	26.7
On-going, regular	37	17.6
On-going, occasional	41	19.5
Time limited	76	36.2
	Total N = 210	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	191	91.4
No	18	8.6
	Total N = 209	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	193	91.9
No	17	8.1
	Total N = 210	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	82	39.0
Relatives	7	3.3
Neighbour/Friend	1	0.5
Public Health Nurse	2	1.0
Physician	100	47.6
Community Group	2	1.0
Other Formal	11	5.2
Other	5	2.4
	Total N = 210	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	30	14.3
A little difficulty	41	19.5
A lot of difficulty	89	42.4
Not at all	50	23.8
	Total N = 210	

A.1.2 School Social Workers

One in ten families (9.8%, N = 51) received the services of a school social worker in the past year (see Table A.1.2). This assistance was mainly for a child (84.3%, N = 43), although a small percentage of respondents (15.7%, N = 8) were helped by the social worker. The service provided was largely counselling for a behavioural problem (66.7%, N = 34) or other school-related problem (9.8%, N = 5). Assistance from a school social worker was largely provided outside the respondent's home (88.2%, N = 45).

The services of a school social worker were received usually less often than once a month (54.0%, N = 27), although for about forty per cent (40.0%, N = 20) help was received more often than once a month. Eighty-eight per cent of families (88.0%, N = 44) had been receiving the assistance of a school social worker for less than one year. Around equal numbers of respondents received help either once only (21.6%, N = 11), on a time-limited basis (27.5%, N = 14), on an on-going regular (23.5%, N = 12) or on-going occasional basis (27.5%, N = 14).

Almost ninety per cent of respondents described the services of school social workers as the "right kind of help" (89.4%, N = 42), and eighty per cent (79.6%, N = 39) of respondents considered it to be "enough help". Meetings with the school social worker were arranged mostly through formal channels such as a teacher or the school (45.1%, N = 23), a social worker (9.8%, N = 5), or community group (5.9%, N = 3), although about one-quarter (25.5%, N = 13) of respondents did arrange for this service themselves. Without the services of school social workers, eight per cent (8.2%, N = 4) of those receiving this service would not be "able to get by" and a further thirty-seven per cent (36.7%, N = 18) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.2

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM SCHOOL SOCIAL WORKERS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from school social workers?		
Yes	51	9.8
No	470	90.2
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	8	15.7
Child	43	84.3
	Total N = 51	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Guidance, counselling	34	66.7
Child in special education classes	5	9.8
Financial advice	4	7.8
Talked to the child	4	7.8
Other	4	7.8
	Total N = 51	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	6	11.8
Out of Building/Project	45	88.2
	Total N = 51	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	3	6.0
2 or 3 times a week	5	10.0
Once a week	3	6.0
1 to 3 times a month	9	18.0
Less than once a month	27	54.0
Other	3	6.0
	Total N = 50	
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	12	24.0
Less than 6 months	24	48.0
6 months to one year	8	16.0
More than one to two years	3	6.0
More than two to three years	1	2.0
More than three to four years	1	2.0
Over four years	1	2.0
	Total N = 50	

TABLE A.1.2 (Continued)

	N	%
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	11	21.6
On-going, regular	12	23.5
On-going, occasional	14	27.5
Time limited	14	27.5
	Total N = 51	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	39	79.6
No	10	20.4
	Total N = 49	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	42	89.4
No	5	10.6
	Total N = 47	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	13	25.5
Relatives	2	3.9
Neighbour/Friend	1	2.0
Teacher/School	23	45.1
Physician	2	3.9
Community Group	3	5.9
Social Worker	5	9.8
Other Formal	2	3.9
	Total N = 51	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	8	16.3
A little difficulty	19	38.8
A lot of difficulty	18	36.7
Not at all	4	8.2
	Total N = 49	

A.1.3 Mental Health Services for Adults

In the past year, about seven per cent (6.5%, N = 34) of respondents or their family members received mental health services (see Table A.1.3). In eight out of ten cases (79.4%, N = 27) this assistance was for the respondent, and took place outside the housing project. The service provided consisted mainly of counselling (29.4%, N = 10) or consulting with a psychiatrist (47.1%, N = 16), and was related to problems with anxiety for two-thirds of the families.

About one-half (52.9%, N = 18) of the respondents or their families used mental health services less than once a month and, almost one-quarter (23.5%, N = 8) of respondents reported the use of this service once a week or more. Over three-quarters (76.5%, N = 26) of the families received mental health services for less than one year. Almost one-half of the families received mental health services either once only (23.5%, N = 8) or on a time-limited basis (20.6%, N = 7). Forty-four per cent (44.1%, N = 15) of families receiving this service were being helped on an on-going regular basis.

Three in four families receiving mental health services considered it to be both "enough help" (75.8%, N = 25) and the "right kind of help" (81.2%, N = 26). Mental health services were arranged mainly through formal sources such as a physician (44.1%, N = 15) or other formal agency (20.6%, N = 7), although about one-quarter of the respondents (26.5%, N = 9) arranged for this service themselves. Without help from mental health services, about nine per cent (8.8%, N = 3) of families receiving this service would not be "able to get by" and a further fifty-nine per cent (58.8%, N = 20) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.3

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR ADULTS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from mental health services for adults?		
Yes	34	6.5
No	487	93.5
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	27	79.4
Spouse/Housemate	3	8.8
Child	4	11.8
	Total N = 34	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Consulting with a psychiatrist	16	47.1
Counselling	10	29.4
Other	8	23.5
	Total N = 34	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
Out of Building/Project	33	100.0
	Total N = 33	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	2	5.9
2 or 3 times a week	1	2.9
Once a week	5	14.7
1 to 3 times a month	8	23.5
Less than once a month	18	52.9
	Total N = 34	

TABLE A.1.3 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	8	23.5
Less than 6 months	9	26.5
6 months to one year	9	26.5
More than one to two years	3	8.8
More than three to four years	1	2.9
Over four years	4	11.8

Total N = 34

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	8	23.5
On-going, regular	15	44.1
On-going, occasional	4	11.8
Time limited	7	20.6

Total N = 34

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	25	75.8
No	8	24.2

Total N = 33

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	26	81.2
No	6	18.8

Total N = 32

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	9	26.5
Neighbour/Friend	1	2.9
Physician	15	44.1
Community Group	2	5.9
Other Formal	7	20.6

Total N = 34

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	2	5.9
A little difficulty	9	26.5
A lot of difficulty	20	58.8
Not at all	3	8.8

Total N = 34

A.1.4 Mental Health Services for Children

Almost five per cent (4.4%, N = 23) of families have received help from mental health services for children in the past year (see Table A.1.4). This help was for a child (95.7%, N = 22) and was mainly psychiatric (43.5%, N = 10) or other counselling (34.8%, N = 8). Treatment occurred outside the housing project and generally took place once a week (30.4%, N = 7) or several times per month (30.4%, N = 7). Almost eighty per cent (78.3%, N = 18) of these families received mental health services for children for less than a year. Mental health services were used mainly on an on-going regular (39.1%, N = 9) or on-going occasional basis (26.1%, N = 6).

Around seventy per cent (69.9%, N = 16) of those receiving mental health services felt that it was "enough help" and the "right kind of help" (73.9%, N = 17). These services were arranged mainly through formal sources such as a physician (21.7%, N = 5), a community group (13.0%, N = 3), a social worker (26.1%, N = 6) or a teacher at school (8.7%, N = 2). About one-quarter (26.1%, N = 6) of respondents, however, did arrange this service themselves. Without mental health services, thirteen per cent (13.0%, N = 3) of the families receiving this help indicated that they would not be "able to get by", and a further fifty-seven per cent (56.5%, N = 13) said they would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.4

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES FOR CHILDREN

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from mental health services for children?		
Yes	23	4.4
No	498	95.6
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	1	4.3
Child	22	95.7
	Total N = 23	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Consulting with a psychiatrist	10	43.5
Counselling, needed advice	8	34.8
Other	5	21.7
	Total N = 23	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
Out of Building/Project	23	100.0
	Total N = 23	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
2 or 3 times a week	2	8.7
Once a week	7	30.4
1 to 3 times a month	7	30.4
Less than once a month	4	17.4
Other	3	13.0
	Total N = 23	

TABLE A.1.4 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	2	8.7
Less than 6 months	10	43.5
6 months to one year	6	26.1
More than one to two years	3	13.0
More than two to three years	1	4.3
Over four years	1	4.3
	Total N = 23	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	4	17.4
On-going, regular	9	39.1
On-going, occasional	6	26.1
Time limited	4	17.4
	Total N = 23	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	16	69.6
No	7	30.4
	Total N = 23	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	17	73.9
No	6	26.1
	Total N = 23	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	6	26.1
Physician	5	21.7
Community Group	3	13.0
Children's Aid	1	4.3
Social Worker	6	26.1
Teacher/School	2	8.7
	Total N = 23	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	3	13.0
A little difficulty	4	17.4
A lot of difficulty	13	56.5
Not at all	3	13.0
	Total N = 23	

A.1.5 Pre-School Child Day Care Programs

In the past year, over ten per cent (10.9%, N = 57) of families used a pre-school child day care program (see Table A.1.5). The day care program was mainly for the child (76.8%, N = 43), although about twenty per cent (19.5%, N = 11) described this as help for themselves. Two main reasons for using pre-school child day care programs were cited. First, day care was used by working respondents or by respondents who were attending school to provide care for their child during the day, and second, children were sent to day care programs for reasons related to socialization. While nine out of ten (91.1%, N = 51) respondents sent their child to a day care program outside the project, about ten per cent (8.9%, N = 5) used day care facilities in the housing project.

Most children attended day care on a daily basis (83.9%, N = 47). The length of time respondents used pre-school child day care programs varied from less than six months (37.5%, N = 21) to more than two to three years (23.2%, N = 13). Day care was provided on an on-going regular basis for three-quarters (76.8%, N = 43) of the families using it.

Over ninety-five per cent of respondents described the services of a day care as "enough help" (94.5%, N = 52) and the "right kind of help" (96.4%, N = 56). Day care was arranged through a variety of sources, including the respondents themselves (35.7%, N = 20), a physician (10.7%, N = 6), a community group (10.7%, N = 6), and other formal and informal sources. Without pre-school child day care programs, sixteen per cent (16.1%, N = 9) of those using the service would not be "able to get by" and a further forty-six per cent (46.4%, N = 26) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.5

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM PRE-SCHOOL CHILD DAY CARE PROGRAMS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from pre-school child day care programs?		
Yes	57	10.9
No	464	89.1
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	11	19.6
Spouse/Housemate	1	1.8
Child	43	76.8
Other	1	1.8
	Total N = 56	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Child goes to day care (unspecified)	28	50.0
Child goes all day	12	21.4
Child goes to morning day care	5	8.9
Child goes to afternoon day care	4	7.1
Other	7	12.5
	Total N = 56	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Building/Project	5	8.9
Out of Building/Project	51	91.1
	Total N = 56	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	47	83.9
2 or 3 times a week	2	3.6
Once a week	3	5.4
1 to 3 times a month	3	5.4
Less than once a month	1	1.8
	Total N = 56	

TABLE A.1.5 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	1	1.8
Less than 6 months	21	37.5
6 months to one year	14	25.0
More than one to two years	7	12.5
More than two to three years	13	23.2
	Total N = 56	

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	1	1.8
On-going, regular	43	76.8
On-going, occasional	2	3.6
Time limited	10	17.9
	Total N = 56	

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	52	94.5
No	3	5.5
	Total N = 55	

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	54	96.4
No	2	3.6
	Total N = 56	

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	20	35.7
Relatives	3	5.4
Neighbour/Friend	5	8.9
Physician	6	10.7
Community Group	6	10.7
Social Worker	3	5.4
Teacher/School	4	7.1
Other Formal	7	12.5
Other	2	3.6
	Total N = 56	

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	7	12.5
A little difficulty	14	25.0
A lot of difficulty	26	46.4
Not at all	9	16.1
	Total N = 56	

A.1.6 Help from the Police

Almost one-quarter (24.0%, N = 125) of families had assistance from the police in the past year (see Table A.1.6). This assistance was mainly for the respondent (59.2%, N = 74) followed by a child (36.8%, N = 46). Help from the police included dealing with problems with property damage (18.4%, N = 20), disputes with family members and friends (16%, N = 20), missing persons (10.4%, N = 13), neighbours (9.6%, N = 12), etc. Police help was received mainly in the respondent's home (57.3%, N = 71), followed by outside the housing project (37.1%, N = 46).

The services of the police took place most often less than once a month (60.8%, N = 76), and occurred only once, or a few times (60.0%, N = 75) within the past year. About eighty per cent of respondents described the help given by police as "enough help" (81.5%, N = 101) or the "right kind of help" (84.0%, N = 105). In two-thirds of the families help was arranged by the respondents themselves (67.5%, N = 83), and in fourteen per cent of families (13.8%, N = 17) assistance was arranged by the police or the courts. Without the services of the police, nine per cent (8.8%, N = 11) of respondents having contact with the police would not be "able to get by", and a further thirty-seven per cent of respondents (36.8%, N = 46) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.6

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM THE POLICE

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from the police?		
Yes	125	24.0
No	396	76.0
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	74	59.2
Spouse/Housemate	4	3.2
Child	46	36.8
Other	1	0.8
	Total N = 125	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Help with property damage problems	23	18.4
Help with family/friend disputes	20	16.0
Help with missing persons	13	10.4
Help with a neighbour problem	12	9.6
Other	57	45.6
	Total N = 125	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	71	57.3
In Building/Project	7	5.6
Out of Building/Project	46	37.1
	Total N = 124	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	2	1.6
2 or 3 times a week	2	1.6
Once a week	2	1.6
1 to 3 times a month	11	8.8
Less than once a month	76	60.8
Other	32	25.6
	Total N = 125	

TABLE A.1.6 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	92	73.6
Less than 6 months	6	4.8
6 months to one year	15	12.0
More than one to two years	9	7.2
More than two to three years	1	0.8
More than three to four years	1	0.8
Over four years	1	0.8
	Total N = 125	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	75	60.0
On-going, regular	3	2.4
On-going, occasional	20	16.0
Time limited	27	21.6
	Total N = 125	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	101	81.5
No	23	18.5
	Total N = 124	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	105	84.0
No	20	16.0
	Total N = 125	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	83	67.5
Relatives	9	7.3
Neighbour/Friend	6	4.9
Police or Court	17	13.8
Teacher/School	2	1.6
Stranger/Citizen	3	2.4
Other	3	2.4
	Total N = 123	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	33	26.4
A little difficulty	35	28.0
A lot of difficulty	46	36.8
Not at all	11	8.8
	Total N = 125	

A.1.7 Children's Aid Society

In the past year, almost eleven per cent (10.6%, N = 55) of families received the services of the Children's Aid Society (see Table A.1.7). This service was mainly for the child (61.8%, N = 34), although over one-third (36.4%, N = 20) of respondents reported this help was for them. The Children's Aid Society provided counselling and guidance in two-thirds of the families helped (65.9%, N = 36). This assistance largely took place outside the housing project (67.3%, N = 37), although almost one-third (30.9%, N = 17) of the families receiving this service had a Children's Aid worker visit their home.

The services of the Children's Aid Society were mainly provided either less than once a month (34.5%, N = 19), one to three times a month (30.9%, N = 17), or once a week or more (29.1%, N = 16). Assistance was received by sixty-three per cent (62.9%, N = 34) of respondents for one year or less while thirty-seven per cent (37.1%, N = 20) had help from the Children's Aid Society for over one year. While some respondents used the Children's Aid Society once only (14.5%, N = 8) or on a time-limited basis (27.3%, N = 15), almost sixty per cent of respondents reported assistance on an on-going regular or occasional basis (58.2%, N = 32).

About eighty-five per cent of respondents receiving assistance felt that the help they received from the Children's Aid Society was "enough help" (85.5%, N = 47) and the "right kind of help" (85.2%, N = 46). This service was arranged through a wide variety of informal and formal sources, the most frequent being the respondents themselves (42.6%, N = 23), a neighbour or friend (9.3%, N = 5), a physician (9.3%, N = 5) or a community group (13.0%, N = 7). Without help from the Children's Aid, eleven per cent (11.3%, N = 6) of those receiving this service would not be "able to get by", and a further thirty-four per cent (34.0%, N = 18) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.7

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM CHILDREN'S AID SOCIETY

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from the Children's Aid Society?		
Yes	55	10.6
No	466	89.4
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	20	36.4
Child	34	61.8
Other	1	1.8
	Total N = 55	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Counselling, guidance	36	65.5
Child is with Children's Aid	5	9.1
Other	14	25.4
	Total N = 55	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	17	30.9
In Building/Project	1	1.8
Out of Building/Project	37	67.3
	Total N = 55	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	2	3.6
2 or 3 times a week	5	9.1
Once a week	9	16.4
1 to 3 times a month	17	30.9
Less than once a month	19	34.5
Other	3	5.5
	Total N = 55	
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	10	18.5
Less than 6 months	12	22.2
6 months to one year	12	22.2
More than one to two years	9	16.7
More than two to three years	6	11.1
More than three to four years	1	1.9
Over four years	4	7.4
	Total N = 54	

TABLE A.1.7 (Continued)

	N	%
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	8	14.5
On-going, regular	16	29.1
On-going, occasional	16	29.1
Time limited	15	27.3
	Total N = 55	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	47	85.5
No	8	14.5
	Total N = 55	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	46	85.2
No	8	14.8
	Total N = 54	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	23	42.6
Relatives	2	3.7
Neighbour/Friend	5	9.3
Police or Court	2	3.7
Public Health Nurse	2	3.7
Physician	5	9.3
Community Group	7	13.0
Social Worker	4	7.4
Other Formal	3	5.5
Other	1	1.9
	Total N = 54	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	8	15.1
A little difficulty	21	39.6
A lot of difficulty	18	34.0
Not at all	6	11.3
	Total N = 53	

A.1.8 Family Counselling Services

Five per cent (5.0%, N = 26) of respondents or their family members received counselling services in the past year. This assistance was mainly for the respondent (61.5%, N = 16), although other family members received this service as well. Family counselling was conducted outside the housing project (96.1%, N = 25). The frequency of family counselling varied from as often as once a week or more for about a third (30.8%, N = 8) of those receiving this service to less than once a month for another third (34.6%, N = 9). The length of time families received family counselling also varied, from twelve per cent (12.0%, N = 3) for a few times only to eight per cent (8.0%, N = 2) for over four years. The receipt of family counselling services tended to be either on-going regular (42.3%, N = 11) or on-going occasional (23.1%, N = 6).

Eighty-nine per cent (88.5%, N = 23) of respondents described family counselling as the "right kind of help", however, seventy per cent (69.2%, N = 18) of those receiving family counselling services felt that it was not "enough help". Family counselling was arranged through a variety of sources, including the respondents themselves (34.6%, N = 9), a physician (23.1%, N = 6), a relative (11.5%, N = 3) or a teacher or school (11.5%, N = 3). Without family counselling, fifteen per cent (15.4%, N = 4) of those using this service would not be "able to get by", and a further forty-two per cent (42.3%, N = 11) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.8

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM FAMILY COUNSELLING SERVICE

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from family counselling service?		
Yes	26	5.0
No	495	95.0
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	16	61.5
Spouse/Housemate	2	7.7
Child	4	15.4
Other	4	15.4
	Total N = 26	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Family Counselling, advice	19	73.1
Other	7	26.9
	Total N = 26	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	1	3.9
Out of Building/Project	25	96.1
	Total N = 26	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	2	7.7
2 or 3 times a week	2	7.7
Once a week	4	15.4
1 to 3 times a month	8	30.8
Less than once a month	9	34.6
Other	1	3.8
	Total N = 26	
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	3	12.0
Less than 6 months	9	36.0
6 months to one year	5	20.0
More than one to two years	2	8.0
More than two to three years	3	12.0
More than three to four years	1	4.0
Over four years	2	8.0
	Total N = 25	

TABLE A.1.8 (Continued)

	N	%
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	4	15.4
On-going, regular	11	42.3
On-going, occasional	6	23.1
Time limited	5	19.2
	Total N = 26	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	18	69.2
No	8	30.8
	Total N = 26	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	23	88.5
No	3	11.5
	Total N = 26	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	9	34.6
Relatives	3	11.5
Neighbour/Friend	1	3.8
Physician	6	23.1
Police or Court	2	7.7
Teacher/School	3	11.5
Other Formal	2	7.7
	Total N = 26	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	3	11.5
A little difficulty	8	30.8
A lot of difficulty	11	42.3
Not at all	4	15.4
	Total N = 26	

A.1.9 Big Brothers/Big Sisters

Six per cent (6.1%, N = 32) of families had received the services of Big Brothers or Big Sisters in the past year (see Table A.1.9). This help usually took place outside the respondent's housing project (78.1%, N = 25), and occurred once a week or more for six in ten families (61.3%, N = 19). The length of time families had used Big Brothers or Sisters ranged from forty-one per cent (40.7%, N = 13) for one year or less to twelve per cent (12.5%, N = 4) for over four years. This help was generally on an on-going regular basis (78.1%, N = 25).

About eighty-five per cent of respondents described the assistance they received from Big Brothers/Big Sisters as both "enough help" (84.4%, N = 27) and the "right kind of help" (87.5%, N = 28). This service was arranged either by the respondents themselves (59.4%, N = 19) by neighbours and friends (12.5%, N = 4) or by a community group (15.6%, N = 5). Without the help of Big Brothers or Sisters, almost twenty per cent (18.8%, N = 6) of respondents who received this help said they would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.9

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM BIG BROTHERS/BIG SISTERS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from Big Brothers/Big Sisters?		
Yes	32	6.1
No	489	93.9
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Child	32	100.0
	Total N = 32	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Big Sister	15	46.9
Big Brother	13	40.6
Other	4	12.5
	Total N = 32	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	7	21.9
Out of Building/Project	25	78.1
	Total N = 32	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	1	3.2
2 or 3 times a week	2	6.5
Once a week	16	51.6
1 to 3 times a month	8	25.8
Less than once a month	3	9.7
Other	1	3.2
	Total N = 31	
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	1	3.1
Less than 6 months	6	18.8
6 months to one year	6	18.8
More than one to two years	11	34.4
More than two to three years	3	9.4
More than three to four years	1	3.1
Over four years	4	12.5
	Total N = 32	

TABLE A.1.9 (Continued)

	N	%
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	2	6.3
On-going, regular	25	78.1
On-going, occasional	4	12.5
Time limited	1	3.1
	Total N = 32	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	27	84.4
No	5	15.6
	Total N = 32	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	28	87.5
No	4	12.5
	Total N = 32	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	19	59.4
Relatives	1	3.1
Neighbour/Friend	4	12.5
Community Group	5	15.6
Social Worker	3	9.4
	Total N = 32	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	8	25.0
A little difficulty	18	56.3
A lot of difficulty	6	18.8
	Total N = 32	

A.1.10 Job Counselling

Thirteen per cent (12.7%, N = 66) of families had received the services of a job counsellor in the past year (see Table A.1.10). In about two-thirds (63.6%, N = 42) of these families job counselling was for the respondent; in about twenty-one per cent (21.2%, N = 14) of families job counselling was for the spouse or housemate, and fifteen per cent of the job counselling (15.2%, N = 10) was for a child.

Job counselling was most likely to take place less often than once a month (39.4%, N = 26), followed by one to three times per month (21.2%, N = 14). Most families (89.4%, N = 59) received job counselling for less than one year, with over forty per cent (40.9%, N = 27) of families receiving this service within the last six months. The basis on which job counselling took place varied. Job counselling was received by about eighteen per cent (18.2%, N = 12) of these families only once, and to thirty-two per cent of these families on a time-limited basis (31.8%, N = 21). One-half of respondents received job counselling either on an on-going regular basis (28.8%, N = 19) or on an on-going occasional basis (21.2%, N = 14).

Seventy per cent (70.8%, N = 46) of those receiving job counselling indicated it was "enough help" and seventy-five per cent (75.0%, N = 48) thought it was the "right kind of help". Arrangements for this service were made by a variety of sources, including the respondents themselves (54.5%, N = 36), a relative (13.6%, N = 9), or other formal sources (25.7%, N = 17). Without job counselling services, six per cent (6.3%, N = 4) of those receiving this service would not be "able to get by", and thirty-one per cent (31.3%, N = 20) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.10

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM JOB COUNSELLING

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from job counselling?		
Yes	66	12.7
No	455	87.3
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	42	63.6
Spouse/Housemate	14	21.2
Child	10	15.2
	Total N = 66	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Career counselling	25	37.9
Manpower programme	19	28.8
Job retraining	5	7.6
Other	17	25.8
	Total N = 66	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Building/Project	1	1.5
Out of Building/Project	65	98.5
	Total N = 66	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	11	16.7
2 or 3 times a week	5	7.6
Once a week	8	12.1
1 to 3 times a month	14	21.2
Less than once a month	26	39.4
Other	2	3.0
	Total N = 66	

TABLE A.1.10 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	12	18.2
Less than 6 months	27	40.9
6 months to one year	20	30.3
More than one to two years	5	7.6
More than two to three years	2	3.0

Total N = 66

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	12	18.2
On-going, regular	19	28.8
On-going, occasional	14	21.2
Time limited	21	31.8

Total N = 66

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	46	70.8
No	19	29.2

Total N = 65

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	48	75.0
No	16	25.0

Total N = 64

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	36	54.5
Relatives	9	13.6
Neighbour/Friend	1	1.5
Welfare/Mothers' Allowance	3	4.5
Social Worker	2	3.0
Canada Manpower	3	4.5
Teacher/School	4	6.1
Other Formal	5	7.6

Total N = 66

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	22	34.4
A little difficulty	18	28.1
A lot of difficulty	20	31.3
Not at all	4	6.3

Total N = 64

A.1.11 Educational Upgrading Programs

In the past year, sixteen per cent (16.1%, N = 84) of respondents or their family members used educational upgrading programs (see Table A.1.11). This service was mainly for the respondent (84.3%, N = 70), and was taken outside the housing project (84.3%, N = 70). Two-thirds (63.4%, N = 52) of those enrolled in educational upgrading programs attended four times a week or more, while another fifteen per cent (14.6%, N = 12) attended two or three times per week. Most of the family members using this service had done so for less than one year (71.9%, N = 59), and attendance was on an on-going regular (67.1%, N = 55) or time-limited basis (22.0%, N = 18).

Educational upgrading was considered by over ninety per cent of respondents using this service to be both "enough help" (90.1%, N = 73) and the "right kind of help" (90.2%, N = 74). This service was arranged through a variety of sources, including the respondent (50.0%, N = 41), Canada Manpower (14.6%, N = 12) and other informal (14.6%, N = 12) and formal sources (20.6%, N = 17). Without educational upgrading, six per cent (6.2%, N = 5) of respondents using this service indicated they would not be "able to get by", and a further thirty-seven per cent (37.1%, N = 30) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.11

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM EDUCATIONAL UPGRADING PROGRAMS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from educational upgrading programs?		
Yes	84	16.1
No	437	83.9
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	70	84.3
Spouse/Housemate	6	7.2
Child	7	8.4
	Total N = 83	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Upgrading high school	24	28.9
Adult learning centre	24	28.9
Correspondence courses	10	12.0
Other	25	30.1
	Total N = 83	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	11	13.3
In Building/Project	2	2.4
Out of Building/Project	70	84.3
	Total N = 83	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	52	63.4
2 or 3 times a week	12	14.6
Once a week	6	7.3
1 to 3 times a month	5	6.1
Less than once a month	7	8.5
	Total N = 82	

TABLE A.1.11 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	3	3.7
Less than 6 months	36	43.9
6 months to one year	23	28.0
More than one to two years	10	12.2
More than two to three years	6	7.3
More than three to four years	1	1.2
Over four years	3	3.7

Total N = 82

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	3	3.7
On-going, regular	55	67.1
On-going, occasional	6	7.3
Time limited	18	22.0

Total N = 82

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	73	90.1
No	8	9.9

Total N = 81

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	74	90.2
No	8	9.8

Total N = 82

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	41	50.0
Relatives	6	7.3
Neighbour/Friend	6	7.3
Canada Manpower	12	14.6
Teacher/School	6	7.3
Social Worker	5	6.1
Community Group	2	2.4
Other Formal	4	4.8

Total N = 82

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	26	32.1
A little difficulty	20	24.7
A lot of difficulty	30	37.1
Not at all	5	6.2

Total N = 81

A.1.12 Educational Community Information and Referral Service

Educational community information and referral services were used by six per cent (6.1%, N = 32) of families over the last year (see Table A.1.12). Three-quarters (78.1%, N = 25) of this service was received by the respondents, and the rest by the spouse (6.3%, N = 2) or children (15.6%, N = 5). For seventy-five per cent (75.0%, N = 24) of families, assistance was given outside the housing project. The use of information and referral services was generally on an infrequent basis, with three-quarters (75.0%, N = 24) of these families getting information less than once a month. While sixteen per cent (15.6%, N = 5) of families received information once only, about one-half (50.0%, N = 16) of the families obtained information on an on-going occasional basis.

Over ninety per cent of respondents described this service as providing "enough help" (90.6%, N = 29) and the "right kind of help" (90.6%, N = 29). Assistance was arranged mainly by the respondents themselves (68.8%, N = 22) or by a formal source (25.0%, N = 8). Without the services of an educational community information and referral service, forty-four per cent (43.8%, N = 14) of those using this service would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.12

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM EDUCATIONAL COMMUNITY INFORMATION AND REFERRAL SERVICE

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from community information and referral service?		
Yes	32	6.1
No	489	93.9
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	25	78.1
Spouse/Housemate	2	6.3
Child	5	15.6
	Total N = 32	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Information service	20	62.5
Local centre service	5	15.6
Other	7	21.9
	Total N = 32	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	5	15.6
In Building/Project	3	9.4
Out of Building/Project	24	75.0
	Total N = 32	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	1	3.1
2 or 3 times a week	2	6.3
Once a week	1	3.1
1 to 3 times a month	3	9.4
Less than once a month	24	75.0
Other	1	3.1
	Total N = 32	

TABLE A.1.12 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	10	31.3
Less than 6 months	1	3.1
6 months to one year	7	21.9
More than one to two years	4	12.5
More than two to three years	3	9.4
More than three to four years	3	9.4
Over four years	4	12.5
	Total N = 32	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	5	15.6
On-going, regular	4	12.5
On-going, occasional	16	50.0
Time limited	7	21.9
	Total N = 32	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	29	90.6
No	3	9.4
	Total N = 32	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	29	90.6
No	3	9.4
	Total N = 32	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	22	68.8
Relatives	1	3.1
Neighbour/Friend	1	3.1
Physician	1	3.1
Community Group	2	6.3
Other Formal	5	15.6
	Total N = 32	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	2	6.3
A little difficulty	15	46.9
A lot of difficulty	14	43.8
Not at all	1	3.1
	Total N = 32	

A.1.13 Counselling on Family Law Matters

In the past year, eleven per cent (11.3%, N = 59) of families received counselling on family law matters (see Table A.1.13). This service was mainly used by the respondent (88.1%, N = 52), although about twelve per cent (11.9%, N = 7) of the counselling was for a child. Among others, the two major reasons for seeking legal help was to arrange collection of neglected support payments (39.0%, N = 23) and to arrange a divorce or a separation (16.9%, N = 10). Counselling on family law matters generally occurred less than once a month (61.0%, N = 36) and one to three times per month for about one-quarter (23.7%, N = 14) of families. For eight in ten (81.3%, N = 48) families, family law counselling occurred only within the past year. Help was provided on a variety of terms, including once (28.8%, N = 17), on-going regular (20.3%, N = 12), on-going occasional (25.4%, N = 15) and time-limited (25.4%, N = 15).

"Enough help" was received by over eighty-six per cent (86.4%, N = 51) of the families, and for most, it was the "right kind of help" (87.9%, N = 51). Family law counselling was arranged by a variety of sources, including the respondents themselves (64.4%, N = 38), formal agencies such as the police or courts (11.9%, N = 7), a social worker (5.1%, N = 3), or a community agency (6.8%, N = 4). Without help in family law matters, seventeen per cent (16.9%, N = 10) of families using this service would not be "able to get by", and a further forty-six per cent (45.8%, N = 27) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.13

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM COUNSELLING ON FAMILY LAW MATTERS

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from counselling on family law matters?		
Yes	59	11.3
No	462	88.7
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	52	88.1
Child	7	11.9
	Total N = 59	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Support payment help	23	39.0
Legal aid	14	23.7
Divorce or separation help	10	16.9
Other	12	20.3
	Total N = 59	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	2	3.4
In Building/Project	2	3.4
Out of Building/Project	55	93.2
	Total N = 59	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	3	5.1
2 or 3 times a week	2	3.4
Once a week	1	1.7
1 to 3 times a month	14	23.7
Less than once a month	36	61.0
Other	3	5.1
	Total N = 59	

TABLE A.1.13 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	19	32.2
Less than 6 months	15	25.4
6 months to one year	14	23.7
More than one to two years	7	11.9
More than two to three years	2	3.4
More than three to four years	1	1.7
Over four years	1	1.7
	Total N = 59	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	17	28.8
On-going, regular	12	20.3
On-going, occasional	15	25.4
Time limited	15	25.4
	Total N = 59	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	51	86.4
No	8	13.6
	Total N = 59	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	51	87.9
No	7	12.1
	Total N = 58	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	38	64.4
Relatives	2	3.4
Neighbour/Friend	2	3.4
Police/Court	7	11.9
Social Worker	3	5.1
Community Group	4	6.8
Other	1	1.7
Other Formal	2	3.4
	Total N = 59	
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	7	11.9
A little difficulty	15	25.4
A lot of difficulty	27	45.8
Not at all	10	16.9
	Total N = 59	

A.1.14 Project Staff

Help from project staff was received by one in every five (21.9%, N = 114) families in the past year (see Table A.1.14). This help was mainly provided to the respondent (91.2%, N = 104), and consisted of such things as repairs (53.5%, N = 61), help with finding an apartment (12.3%, N = 14), and meeting with a CRW (8.8%, N = 10). Help was received by three-quarters of the families less than once a month (75.4%, N = 86) and, for about one-third (31.3%, N = 35) of respondents, only once in the past year. For the remainder, help was provided on an on-going occasional (42.0%, N = 47) or time-limited (18.8%, N = 21) basis.

Three-quarters of the families felt that the assistance they received from project staff was "enough help" (77.0%, N = 87) and the "right kind of help" (78.1%, N = 89). Help from the project staff was arranged by either the respondents themselves (71.1%, N = 81), or by the residential council (14.0%, N = 16). Without help from the housing project staff, thirteen per cent (13.4%, N = 15) of the respondents receiving this service said they would not be "able to get by", and forty-six per cent (46.4%, N = 52) indicated that they could get by only with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.14

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM HOUSING PROJECT STAFF

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from housing project staff?		
Yes	114	21.9
No	407	78.1
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	104	91.2
Spouse/Housemate	2	1.8
Child	5	4.4
Other	3	2.6
	Total N = 114	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Maintenance	61	53.5
Helped find apartment	14	12.3
Met with CRW	10	8.8
Other	29	25.4
	Total N = 114	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In unit	70	61.4
In Building/Project	26	22.8
Out of Building/Project	18	15.8
	Total N = 114	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	3	2.6
2 or 3 times a week	1	0.9
1 to 3 times a month	12	10.5
Less than once a month	86	75.4
Other	12	10.5
	Total N = 114	

TABLE A.1.14 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	39	34.2
Less than 6 months	22	19.3
6 months to one year	14	12.3
More than one to two years	8	7.0
More than two to three years	8	7.0
More than three to four years	4	3.5
Over four years	19	16.7

Total N = 114

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	35	31.3
On-going, regular	9	8.0
On-going, occasional	47	42.0
Time limited	21	18.8

Total N = 112

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	87	77.0
No	26	23.0

Total N = 113

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	89	78.1
No	25	21.9

Total N = 114

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	81	71.1
Relatives	4	3.5
Neighbour/Friend	1	1.0
CRW	8	7.0
Residential Council	16	14.0
Other	1	1.0
Other Formal	3	2.6

Total N = 114

TABLE A.1.14 (Continued)

	N	%
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	14	12.5
A little difficulty	31	27.7
A lot of difficulty	52	46.4
Not at all	15	13.4

Total N = 112

A.1.15 Family Benefit Workers

In the past year, over forty per cent (41.1%, N = 214) of families used the services of a family benefit worker (i.e., mother's allowance (55.9%, N = 19) or welfare benefits (19.2%, N = 41) (see Table A.1.15). This service was provided mainly to the respondent (89.3%, N = 191), either in his/her home (55.4%, N = 118) or out of the project (44.1%, N = 94).

In over one-half (54.2%, N = 116) of the families, assistance was provided less than once a month, however, almost forty per cent (39.3%, N = 84) had help one to three times a month. Almost one-third (30.7%, N = 65) of the families used this service for over four years, another third (29.8%, N = 63) for one to four years, and another third (39.6%, N = 84) for less than one year. Help was given on an on-going regular basis for over sixty per cent (60.6%, N = 129) of the families, and on an on-going occasional basis for almost twenty per cent (19.7%, N = 42) of the families.

The help provided by family benefit workers was described by nine out of ten respondents (92.0%, N = 195) as the "right kind of help", and by three in every four respondents (23.5%, N = 50) as "enough help" This service was arranged by either the respondents themselves (58.0%, N = 123), or by the agency itself (22.2%, N = 47). Without assistance from family benefit workers, thirty-five per cent (34.9%, N = 74) of respondents using this service would not be "able to get by", and a further forty-six per cent (45.8%, N = 97) would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.15

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM A FAMILY BENEFIT WORKER

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a family benefit worker?		
Yes	214	41.1
No	307	58.9
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	191	89.3
Spouse/Housemate	7	3.3
Child	14	6.5
Other	2	0.9
	Total N = 214	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Mothers allowance	119	55.9
Welfare benefits	41	19.2
Checks on respondent	17	8.0
Information, advice	12	5.6
Other	24	11.3
	Total N = 213	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	118	55.4
In Building/Project	1	0.5
Out of Building/Project	94	44.1
	Total N = 213	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	6	2.8
2 or 3 times a week	2	0.9
Once a week	1	0.5
1 to 3 times a month	84	39.3
Less than once a month	116	54.2
Other	5	2.3
	Total N = 214	

TABLE A.1.15 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	28	13.2
Less than 6 months	21	9.9
6 months to one year	35	16.5
More than one to two years	26	12.3
More than two to three years	18	8.5
More than three to four years	19	9.0
Over four years	65	30.7

Total N = 212

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	23	10.8
On-going, regular	129	60.6
On-going, occasional	42	19.7
Time limited	19	8.9

Total N = 213

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	163	76.5
No	50	23.5

Total N = 213

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	195	92.0
No	17	8.0

Total N = 212

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	123	58.0
Relatives	4	1.9
Neighbour/Friend	2	0.9
Physician	5	2.4
Welfare/Mother's Allowance	47	22.2
Police/Court	3	1.4
Community Group	10	4.7
Social Worker	5	2.4
Children's Aid	5	2.4
Other	8	3.8

Total N = 212

TABLE A.1.15 (Continued)

	N	%
(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?		
With no difficulty	14	6.6
A little difficulty	27	12.7
A lot of difficulty	97	45.8
Not at all	74	34.9
	Total N = 212	

A.1.16 Other Income Maintenance

One-quarter (24.0%, N = 125) of all families interviewed used other income maintenance sources in the past year (see Table A.1.16). Assistance was most often for the respondent (69.1%, N = 85), although in about twenty per cent (20.3%, N = 25) of the families help was provided to a child. Forms of assistance included welfare benefits (39.0%, N = 48), child support (17.1%, N = 21), pensions (15.4%, N = 19), and unemployment insurance benefits (8.9%, N = 11), etc. Help was provided both in the respondent's homes (47.2%, N = 59) or outside the housing project (52.0%, N = 65).

Assistance from other income maintenance was received one to three times per month by almost three-quarters (74.4%, N = 93) of the families. About half (52.1%, N = 64) the families had been getting other income maintenance support for less than a year, and as many as twenty-one per cent (21.1%, N = 26) of families had been receiving this service for over four years. This help tended to be given on an on-going regular basis (75.0%, N = 93).

Assistance from other income maintenance was described by over ninety per cent as the "right kind of help" (91.8%, N = 112), and by sixty-three per cent (63.4%, N = 78) of respondents as "enough help". Other income maintenance was arranged through a variety of informal (68.3%, N = 84) (i.e., respondent, relatives, friends) and formal sources (31.6%, N = 39). Without help from other income maintenance, thirty-three per cent (33.1%, N = 41) of respondents using this service would not be "able to get by", and a further forty-four per cent (44.4%. N = 55) of respondents would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.16

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM OTHER INCOME MAINTENANCE

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from a other income maintenance?		
Yes	125	24.0
No	396	76.0
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	85	69.1
Spouse/Housemate	13	10.6
Child	25	20.3
	Total N = 123	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Welfare benefits	48	39.0
Child support	21	17.1
Pensions	19	15.4
UIC benefits	11	8.9
Other	24	19.5
	Total N = 123	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	59	47.2
In Building/Project	1	0.8
Out of Building/Project	65	52.0
	Total N = 125	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	3	2.4
2 or 3 times a week	2	1.6
Once a week	3	2.4
1 to 3 times a month	93	74.4
Less than once a month	24	19.2
	Total N = 125	

TABLE A.1.16 (Continued)

	N	%
(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?		
A few times only	5	4.1
Less than 6 months	32	26.0
6 months to one year	27	22.0
More than one to two years	21	17.0
More than two to three years	5	4.1
More than three to four years	7	5.7
Over four years	26	21.1
	Total N = 123	
(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?		
Once	8	6.5
On-going, regular	93	75.0
On-going, occasional	6	4.8
Time limited	17	13.7
	Total N = 124	
(h) Did you receive enough help?		
Yes	78	63.4
No	45	36.6
	Total N = 123	
(i) Was it the right kind of help?		
Yes	112	91.8
No	10	8.2
	Total N = 122	
(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?		
Myself	70	56.9
Relatives	13	10.6
Neighbour/Friend	1	0.8
Police/Court	7	5.7
Welfare/Mother's Allowance	6	4.9
Physician	6	4.9
Social Worker	3	2.4
Children's Aid	3	2.4
Canada Manpower	3	2.4
Teacher/School	2	1.6
Other	9	7.3
	Total N = 123	

TABLE A.1.16 (Continued)

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	10	8.1
A little difficulty	18	14.5
A lot of difficulty	55	44.4
Not at all	41	33.1

Total N = 124

A.1.17 Recreational Community, Drop-In Centres

Recreational community drop-in centres were used by sixteen per cent (15.5%, N = 81) of families in the past year (see Table A.1.17). These centres were mainly used by the children (77.5%, N = 62) who attended, for example, recreational activities (21.0%, n = 17), or children or teen groups (30.9%, n = 25). Almost one-quarter (22.5%, N = 18) of the families also attended these community centres for group meetings. Most families attended these centres outside the housing projects (78.8%, N = 63), although almost twenty per cent (18.8%, N = 15) of families attended a drop-in centre within their own housing project.

The frequency of attendance varied from four times a week or more (12.3%, N = 10) to less than once a month (12.3%, N = 10). The length of time family members used these centres ranged from forty-three per cent (43.3%, N = 35) of families for less than one year to twenty-seven per cent (27.2%, N = 22) of families for over four years. Use tended to be on an on-going regular (66.7%, N = 54) or on-going occasional (23.5%, N = 19) basis.

Nine out of every ten respondents described this help as "enough help" (92.4%, N = 73) and the "right kind of help" (93.7%, N = 74). The use of community centres was arranged through a variety of sources, mainly informal, such as the respondents themselves (50.6%, N = 41), neighbours or friends (16.0%, N = 13) or relatives (14.8%, N = 12). Without the use of recreational community drop-in centres, twenty-one per cent

(21.0%, N = 17) of those using this service would only be able to get by with "a lot of difficulty".

TABLE A.1.17

PUBLIC HOUSING FAMILIES BY HELP FROM RECREATIONAL COMMUNITY DROP-IN CENTRES

	N	%
(a) In the past year, have you or any family member ever received help from recreational community drop-in centres?		
Yes	81	15.5
No	440	84.5
(b) Who was the help/service for?		
Self	18	22.5
Child	62	77.5
	Total N = 80	
(c) What kind of help/service was this?		
Children or Teen groups	25	30.9
Community groups	18	22.2
Recreation activities	17	21.0
YM/YWCA	7	8.6
Other	14	17.3
	Total N = 81	
(d) Where did you receive this help?		
In Unit	2	2.5
In Building/Project	15	18.8
Out of Building/Project	63	78.8
	Total N = 80	
(e) In the past year, how often did you receive this help?		
4 times a week or more	10	12.3
2 or 3 times a week	21	25.9
Once a week	28	34.6
1 to 3 times a month	10	12.3
Less than once a month	10	12.3
Other	2	2.5
	Total N = 81	

TABLE A.1.17 (Continued)

(f) How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help?

	N	%
A few times only	2	2.5
Less than 6 months	19	23.5
6 months to one year	14	17.3
More than one to two years	14	17.3
More than two to three years	7	8.6
More than three to four years	3	3.7
Over four years	22	27.2
	Total N = 81	

(g) Was this help on going regular, on going occasional or time limited?

	N	%
Once	2	2.5
On-going, regular	54	66.7
On-going, occasional	19	23.5
Time limited	6	7.4
	Total N = 81	

(h) Did you receive enough help?

	N	%
Yes	73	92.4
No	6	7.6
	Total N = 79	

(i) Was it the right kind of help?

	N	%
Yes	74	93.7
No	5	6.3
	Total N = 79	

(j) How did you arrange for this help or service?

	N	%
Myself	41	50.6
Relatives	12	14.8
Neighbour/Friend	13	16.0
Teacher/School	2	2.5
Ad or Sign	2	2.5
Community Group	6	7.4
Other Formal	5	6.2
	Total N = 81	

TABLE A.1.17 (Continued)

(k) Without help, would you have been able to get by?

	N	%
With no difficulty	26	32.1
A little difficulty	37	45.7
A lot of difficulty	17	21.0
Not at all	1	1.2

Total N = 81

APPENDIX 2

TABLE A.2.1

Final Response Rates for the Support Service Providers Survey

Municipalities	Number of Agencies/ Services Contacted	Response Rates (N)	Response Rates %	Number of Completed Questionnaires* (N)	Number of Completed Questionnaires* %
Toronto	50	(41)	82.0	(55)	50.5
Sudbury	22	(17)	77.3	(28)	21.2
Peterborough	23	(17)	73.9	(25)	27.2
Belleville	13	(9)	69.2	(16)	30.8
St. Catharines	13	(9)	69.2	(22)	42.3
London	34	(22)	64.7	(57)	18.6
Owen Sound	18	(11)	61.1	(21)	29.2
Total	173	(126)		(224)	

* Each respondent was asked to complete a questionnaire for each sampled housing project in their jurisdiction there are therefore more responses than respondents

TABLE A.2.2

Types of Respondents Grouped According to Job Title

Job Title	(N)	%
Community Relations Worker	(78)	34.8
Public Health Nurse	(39)	17.4
Executive Director, Director Assistant Director and Administrator	(19)	8.5
Police Official	(17)	7.6
Supervisor/Senior Co-ordinator	(14)	6.3
Income Maintenence Officer	(12)	5.4
Manager	(9)	4.0
Chairperson	(6)	2.7
Project Officer	(6)	2.7
Salvation Army Officer	(5)	2.2
Senior Counsellor	(3)	1.3
All Others: Board Member, Credit Counsellor, Team Leader, Staff Lawyer, Specialist, Etc.	(9)	4.0
Title Not Given	(7)	3.1
Total	(224)	100.0

A.2.3

Phase One Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers

Belleville

Big Brothers Association

Big Sisters Association

Childrens' Aid Society

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Worker

Department of Social Services

Police Department

Salvation Army

United Community Services

London

Big Brothers

Big Sisters

Canadian Red Cross

Central Volunteer Bureau

Committee for Children and Youth

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Workers

Family and Childrens' Services

Family Centre/Mission Services

Family Consultant Service (London Police Department)

Family Counselling Centre

Information London

Salvation Army

Seniors Bureau

Social Services Division

Unemployment Help Centre

Owen Sound

Big Brothers

Big Sisters

Bruce County Social Services

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Community and Social Services

Community Relations Workers

Grey/Owen Sound Social and Family Services

Salvation Army

Peterborough

Big Brothers and Big Sisters

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Liason Committee

Community Relations Workers

Family Counselling Service

Family Resource Centre

Home Care Program - Peterborough Health Unit

Meals on Wheels

Ontario Ministry of Social Services

Peterborough Health Unit

Peterborough Information Centre

Police Department

Salvation Army

Senior Citizens' Council

Senior Citizens' Information Bureau

Seniors' Counselling Service

Social Planning Council

United Citizens' Organization

Volunteer Bureau

St. Catharines

Big Brothers and Big Sisters

Community Relations Workers

Family & Childrens' Services

Health Services Department

Salvation Army Family Services

Social Planning Council

Social Services Department

Sudbury

Canadian Red Cross

Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Services Advisory Group

Community and Social Services

Manitoulin-Sudbury District Health Council

Ontario Legal Aid Plan

Ontario Provincial Police

Salvation Army

Social Services Administrative Board

Sudbury and District Health Unit

Metro

Community Relations Workers for the Sampled Housing Units

A.2.4

Phase Two Mailing List for Survey of Support Service Providers

Belleville

Bellville General Hospital (Home Care Patient Referral)

Hastings & Prince Edward Counties Health Unit

Red Cross Homemaking Services

Victorian Order of Nurses (Home Nursing Services)

London

Canadian Red Cross Society/Meals on Wheels

Community and Social Services

Community Home Support Program

Friendship in Action

Legal Aid Plan

Lord Elgin Public School

Middlesex London District Health Unit

Victorian Order of Nurses

Owen Sound

Bruce Grey Childrens' Services

Grey County & Owen Sound Health Services

Home Care Services

Meals on Wheels

Owen Sound Day Nursery

Owen Sound Police Depatment

Victorian Order of Nurses

The Womens' Centre

Peterborough

Activity Haven

Victorian Order of Nurses

St. Catharines

Associated Services

Chief of Police

Information Niagara

Meals on Wheels

Senior Citizens' Recreation Centre

Sudbury

Canada Employment Centre

La Service Familial de la Region de Sudbury, Inc.

Meals on Wheels

New Horizons - Department of National Health and Welfare

Senior Citizens' Association

Senior Citizens' Club

Sudbury and District Health Unit

Sudbury Community Legal Clinic

Sudbury Community Service Centre

Victorian Order of Nurses

Metro

Bellcrest Childrens' Centre

Canadian Red Cross Society/Toronto Scarborough/Jane Finch

Catholic Childrens' Aid Society

Childrens' Aid Society of Metro Toronto

Community Guardians

Community Occupational Therapy Associates

D. B. Hood Community School

Dixon Hall Neighbourhood Social and Family Service Centre

Etobicoke Health Department

Family Service Association of Metro Toronto

Meals on Wheels

Metro Toronto Branch Visiting Homemakers

Metro Toronto Department of Community Services

Metro Toronto Police Department

Ministry of Community and Social Services - Family Benefits

North York Department of Public Health

Sacred Heart Family and Child Centre

Scarborough Community Legal Services

Scarborough Department of Health

Scarborough Volunteer Centre

Teesdale Community Centre

Victorian Order of Nurses

Warden Woods Church and Community Centre

West Hill Community Services

Willowridge Neighbourhood Centre

York Community Services

Metro (con't)

York West Meals on Wheels

York West Services for Seniors

APPENDIX 3

APPENDIX 3: METHODOLOGY: TENANT SURVEY

A.3.1 Study Population and Sampling Design

The study population consists of families living in public housing in the province of Ontario. The majority of housing authorities within the province provide information about their tenants into the Unit Tenant Master File (UTMF) maintained by the Ministry of Housing. The UTMF is coded in the Operational Financial Information System (OFIS) and may be linked to the Building Address File (BAF) maintained by that ministry. Since some of the information to be used in the analysis is to come from the OFIS data source, it was necessary to draw the sample of tenants to be surveyed from this data base.

Not all housing authorities computerize their tenant information using the UTMF, and, as a result, this group was excluded from the sampling population. The excluded group comprises tenants in housing projects in small towns and rural northern areas. Consequently, the sample drawn for purposes of this study is not a random sample of all housing projects in Ontario, but rather only of those housing authorities linked to the Ministry's UTMF.

About thirty-five per cent (35.4) of public housing tenants on this file resided within the Metropolitan Toronto area and the remaining live in other municipalities across Ontario.

The sampling method employed a three stage probability process including the selection of municipalities in which to sample; the selection of housing projects to be sampled within the selected municipalities; and the selection of senior and family tenants within selected housing projects. Each stage will be discussed in more detail below.

Selection of Municipalities

The study design called for 1000 interviews in total (families and seniors combined). Based on the proportion of public housing tenants located in and outside of Metropolitan Toronto 354 tenants were selected from the Metropolitan Toronto area (including Toronto, Etobicoke, Scarborough, York and North York) and 646 tenants from elsewhere in Ontario. Outside Toronto six municipalities were randomly selected to represent other Ontario municipalities. These included Belleville, London, Owen Sound, Peterborough, St. Catharines and Sudbury.

Selection of Housing Projects

The second stage involved the determination of senior and family tenant population for each community and for each selected housing project. The number of interviews to be completed in each municipality was to be proportionate to the total number of

TABLE A.3.1

Survey of Service Use Patterns of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario
Sampling Frame

Municipality & Housing Authority	Total Number of Tenants	Number of Families	Number of Seniors	Number of Tenants to be Interviewed			Number of Housing Projects		
				Total	Families	Seniors	Families	Mixed	Seniors
St. Catharines, North Niagara	1032	416	616	87	35	52	2	0	2
London, London & Middlesex	3123	858	2265	264	73	191	3	0	6
Owen Sound, Grey County & Owen Sound	501	148	353	43	13	30	2	0	2
Peterborough, Peterborough	684	369	315	58	31	27	2	0	2
Belleville, Hastings & Prince Edward	617	210	407	53	18	35	2	0	2
Sudbury, Sudbury District	1667	1023	644	141	87	54	4	0	2
Total Six Communitities Outside Metropolitan Toronto	7624	3024	4600	646	257	389	15	0	16
Metropolitan Toronto,* Metropolitan Toronto	29282	20112	9170	354	244	110	0	19**	0

* Comprised of 7 municipalities exluding East York

** In Metropolitan Toronto, seniors and families reside in mixed housing projects family and senior citizen tenants in public housing in each municipality to the total number of tenants for the six municipalities. Table A.3.1 shows the figures used to determine the number of interviews in each municipality. Note that at the time of sampling, it was not possible to distinguish family tenants from seniors tenants in Metropolitan Toronto. As well, Ontario Housing Corporation is only one of many suppliers of public housing in Toronto. Families' housing, for example, is also supplied through the Metropolitan Toronto Housing Company Ltd. As such, the pattern of supports received by families in Toronto may not be an accurate reflection of the situation of all families in public housing in Metro.

Selection of Tenants Within Selected Housing Projects

Finally, the third stage of sampling involved randomly selecting seniors and tenants in each of the selected projects.

A.3.2 Census Demographics of Municipalities Surveyed

Table A.3.2 presents the total populations and the population broken down by age groups for each municipality according to the 1981 Census. In terms of overall population size, the municipalities are ranked in descending order: Metropolitan Toronto (2,136,400), London (254,275), Sudbury (124,015), St. Catharines (91,830), Peterborough (60,635), Belleville (34,890) and Owen Sound (19,875). Sudbury appears to have proportionately more young people under the age of 19 (32.4%) than the other municipalities (which range from 27.0% for Metropolitan Toronto to 30.6% for St. Catharines). Owen Sound (20.8%) and Peterborough (19.0%) had the highest proportion of older residents (60 years and over), compared to Belleville (18.0%), St. Catharines (16.6%), Metropolitan Toronto (14.9%), London (14.3%) and Sudbury (13.4%).

A second demographic characteristic compiled for each municipality was private household income (see Table A.3.3). In this case, the median private household income, according to the 1981 Census, was slightly higher in the larger municipalities of Metropolitan Toronto ($23,301), St. Catharines ($21,256) and London ($20,635) than in the three smaller municipalities of Peterborough ($19,866), Belleville ($18,598) and Owen Sound ($17,417).

TABLE A.3.2

Total Population and Population by Age Groups for Each Municipality
(1981 Census)

Population Age Groups	Municipalities													
	Belleville		London		Owen Sound		Peterborough		St. Catharines		Sudbury		Metropolitan Toronto*	
	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%	(N)	%
19 and Under	10,370	29.7	75,230	29.6	5,925	29.8	17,660	29.1	37,950	30.6	29,770	32.4	578,000	27.0
20 to 29	6,205	17.8	51,860	20.4	3,390	17.0	11,050	18.2	20,125	16.2	16,260	17.7	411,465	19.3
30 to 39	4,320	12.4	38,305	15.1	2,570	12.9	8,180	13.5	17,415	14.0	12,115	13.2	325,860	15.2
40 to 49	3,625	10.4	26,630	10.5	1,890	9.5	6,030	9.9	13,675	11.0	10,355	11.3	251,525	11.8
50 to 59	4,105	11.8	25,855	10.2	1,960	9.9	6,785	11.2	14,180	11.4	11,000	12.0	252,375	11.8
60 to 64	1,835	5.3	10,505	4.1	925	4.7	3,195	5.3	5,950	4.8	4,005	4.4	92,065	4.3
65 to 74	2,800	8.0	15,795	6.2	1,775	8.9	5,265	8.7	9,095	7.3	5,625	6.1	139,250	6.5
75 to 84	1,270	3.6	7,695	3.0	1,065	5.4	2,335	3.9	4,350	3.5	2,210	2.4	68,005	3.2
85 and Over	370	1.1	2,390	0.9	375	1.9	745	1.2	1,175	0.9	490	0.5	18,785	0.9
Median Age	31.8		30.0		32.0		32.4		32.1		29.9		32.1	
Total N	34,880		254,200		19,885		60,620		124,020		91,830		2,137,390	

(Source: 1981 Census of Canada, "Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households, Census Families in Private Households, Selected Characteristics, Ontario", Table 10, Ottawa, Ministry of Supply and Services, Canada, December 1982 Catalogue # 93-918 Vol. 2, Provincial Series, ISBN 0-0660-51104-5)

TABLE A.3.3

Median Private Annual Household Incomes For Each Municipality (1981 Census)

Municipality	Median Private Annual Household Income	Number of Households
Belleville	$ 18,598	13,280
London	$ 20,635	96,525
Metro Toronto	$ 23,301	776,380
Owen Sound	$ 17,417	7,475
Peterborough	$ 19,866	22,505
St. Catharines	$ 21,256	44,380
Sudbury	$ 21,010	32,030
Total		992,575

(Source: 1981 Census of Canada.; "Population, Occupied Private Dwellings, Private Households and Census and Economic Families in Private Households", Ottawa, Minister of Supply and Services, Canada, 1983 ISBN 0-660-51669-1)

A.3.3 Questionnaire Design and Methodology

Preliminary versions of the questionnaires were prepared under separate contract by Forma Consultants. These questionnaires were subsequently revised by Social Data Research under the supervision of the Steering Committee (see Appendix 5 for copies of the questionnaires).

The tenant survey included questions on the need for and use of supports, both formal supports such as those provided by social service agencies, community groups or organizations and informal supports (i.e., assistance provided by family, friends and neighbours). Also included were questions on health, tenant problems, social networks and personal characteristics (i.e., age, sex, household status, education, income).

The decision was made to use, where appropriate, similar questions on the families and seniors questionnaires. There is a growing body of gerontologial research in these areas and the decision was made to use selected items from previous research instruments as measures in this survey.

Items were selected from the Older American Resources and Services Program (OARS) and the Instrumental and Physical Activities of Daily Living Scale (ADL) (see Question 3) to measure the ability of seniors to perform activities of daily living. These items were modified for purposes of this survey.

A.3.4 Fieldwork Procedure

Prior to the personal interview, tenants in the sample were sent a pre-notification letter from the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing signed by the Director of Housing Policy and Program Development Branch. This letter informed them about the study; asked for their assistance; and told them that an interviewer would be calling at their home to arrange an interview. The tenant survey was carried out by a team of twenty interviewers across the province. Each interviewer was assigned a sample of tenants from one or more housing projects. Interviewers spent the day in a project, calling upon the designated tenants and arranging a mutually convenient time to interview the tenant. Tenants were given the opportunity to refuse to participate if they so desired.

The interviewing began in mid-January of 1985 and was largely completed by March 1, 1985. Interviews took about one hour, on the average, to complete.

A.3.5 Response Rates and Biases

Table A.3.4 shows the target and actual number of interviews obtained in each of the municipalities. While it was possible to identify seniors versus families in public housing in six of the municipalities prior to the interview, this was not possible in Toronto. Consequently, we were not able to target the number of seniors or family interviews to complete in Toronto prior to the fieldwork stage of the study. The data in Table A.3.4 verifies that, with two minor exceptions, the number of interviews completed reached the number targeted for that municipality.

Table A.3.5 shows that, of those contacted, 83.2 per cent were interviewed, 8.8 per cent refused to be interviewed and 8.0 per cent were contacted but not interviewed. This last group included those who asked the interviewer to call back for an interview at a later time, however, before the interview could be completed, the target number of interviews for that housing project had been reached.

The response rate varied somewhat by municipality. For example, Table A.3.5 shows the response rate was lower in Peterborough (72.5%) and higher in Owen Sound (92.9%) and Sudbury (92.4%).

The refusal rate was low at 8.8 per cent, although it did vary from municipality to municipality. Rates in Peterborough (17.5%) and Toronto (14.6%) were slightly higher than in Sudbury (5.4%) and Belleville (4.8%) where the least people refused.

TABLE A.3.4

Family Public Housing Tenants by the Target and Actual Number of Interviews

Municipality	Target Number of Interviews	Number of Interviews Completed
Sudbury	87	86
London	73	73
Belleville	18	18
St. Catharines	35	35
Owen Sound	13	13
Peterborough	31	29
Metropolitan Toronto*	354	267
Total	521	521

* Note, the target proportions of family and senior respondents in Metropolitan Toronto were not known prior to the initiation of tenant interviews. The number interviewed is, however, in proportion with the number of family public housing tenants in Metropolitan Toronto.

TABLE A.3.5

Family Public Housing Tenants by Fieldwork Report

Municipality	Households Contacted	Per Cent Interviewed	Per Cent Refused	Per Cent Non Response
Sudbury	93	92.4	5.4	2.2
London	87	83.9	10.3	5.8
Belleville	21	85.7	4.8	9.5
St. Catharines	39	89.7	5.1	5.2
Owen Sound	14	92.9	7.1	0.0
Peterborough	40	72.5	17.5	10.0
Toronto	332	80.4	14.6	5.0
TOTAL	626	83.2	8.8	8.0

* Includes households that asked the interviewer to call back interview at a later time, however, before the interview could undertaken, the target number of interviews had been reached. more detail see the tables in Appendix 4.

Also see Appendix 4 for a detailed breakdown of response and refusal rates.

A.3.6 Sample Bias

The distribution of sex and family type of respondents was compared to the distribution for heads of households for all public housing family tenants in Ontario on the Ministry's UTMF and to the distributions for the eleven municipalities surveyed.

Table A.3.6 shows that the family public housing respondents were representative in terms of family type to both the comparison groups. These data show that about seventy per cent of the public housing families were single parent families. Table A.3.6 also shows that females tend to be overrepresented in the sample respondents. For example, eighty eight (88.3%) per cent of the respondents were female as compared to about seventy per cent (70.2%) of the "first tenants" from the seven municipalities sampled. This occurred because in a double parent family the male is recorded as the "first tenant", and since the interviewer was instructed to interview either adult family member, the female was more likely to be home and willing to be interviewed.

TABLE A.3.6

Family Type and Sex of Household Heads in the Population of Public Housing Tenants in Ontario* in the Seven Municipalities Surveyed and in the Sample of Tenant Respondents

Characteristics	Provincial Tenant Population*	Tenant Population in the Seven Municipalities Surveyed	Tenant Respondents Population
	%	%	%
Family Type			
Single Parent	70.7	74.5	71.4
Double Parent	29.3	25.5	28.6
Sex of Head of Household			
Female	67.8	70.2	88.3
Male	32.2	29.8	11.7
Total N	35,994-36,009	29,327-29,925	521

* The provincial population of tenants is derived from the Ministry of Housing, Unit Tenant Master File, a large database of tenant data. It contains data for about 80 per cent of public housing tenants in the province. Those tenants not included in the UTMF file reside in rural or smaller centres. The centres involved are Belleville, Cambridge, Guelph, Hamilton, Kingston, Kitchener/Waterloo, London, Mississauga, Metropolitan Toronto, Niagara Falls, Ottawa, Owen Sound, Peterborough, Sault Ste. Marie, St. Catharines, Sudbury, Thunder Bay and Windsor.

A.3.7 Coding

A detailed manual which includes instructions on how to code each question was prepared for the coders. The coding process involved the assignment of numbers to all information recorded. Four coders were trained and the first several questionnaires coded by each coder were checked thoroughly for errors. After the supervisor was satisfied that each coder was accurate and reliable, questionnaires were then randomly checked for errors. Since most of the questions in the questionnaire were closed-ended and pre-coded on the instrument itself, the bulk of the coding involved only the transfer of the code to a coding sheet. In some instances, however, the questions were open-ended and the coders had to refer to the coding manual for the correct code for particular answers. Codes were developed for open-ended questions and added to the manual as they were being coded. The coding manual is available through the Ministry of Municipal Affairs and Housing.

A.3.8 Data Entry, Editing and Analysis

Once the data were coded, they were entered directly into a computer file by data entry clerks at the Ministry of Housing. Upon completion of data entry, the data were edited for out-of-range and inconsistent responses. Out-of-range responses are those in which there is no response category for a particular question which corresponds to the code that has been entered. Inconsistent responses are those which appear to conflict with responses to certain other questions.

After the data had been edited using the procedures outlined above, a fully documented SAS data base was set up. Data from the Ministry of Housing UTMF was then merged with this SAS data base. A set of frequencies were produced (i.e., the incidence and percentage of coded responses to each question) and from this a frequency manual was developed. This manual is also available from the Ministry of Housing.

A.3.9 Impressions of the Interviewers

The interviewers selected for the project were either experienced interviewers or professionals such as nurses or social workers.

After completing the interview, the interviewers were instructed to fill out a comment sheet to provide information on the quality of the interview and the co-operation of the respondent. The interviewers reported that almost ninety-four per cent of the respondents were co-operative (see Table A.3.7) and the interviewers rated the reliability of answers to be either completely reliable (78.5%) or reliable on most answers (20.1%). The interviewers' impressions of the quality of the interviews lend credence to the contention that the interviews accurately reflect the situation of families in public housing across the municipalities surveyed.

TABLE A.3.7

Family Public Housing Respondents, Survey Reliability as Reported by the Interviewers

Interviewer Reliability Rating	(N)	%
Tenant Co-operation		
Co-operative and interested	(432)	82.9
Co-operative but indifferent	(56)	10.7
Changeable, anxious	(16)	3.1
Suspicious, guarded	(15)	2.7
Hostile, unco-operative	(1)	.2
Missing	(1)	.2
Tenant Comprehension		
Quick and correct	(403)	77.4
Slow but correct	(77)	14.8
Slow and confused	(32)	6.1
Quick but not correct	(5)	1.0
Barely able to function	(2)	.1
Missing	(2)	.1
Tenant Reliability of Answers		
Completely reliable	(409)	78.5
Reliable on most	(105)	20.1
Reliable on a few	(3)	.6
Completely unreliable	(3)	.6
Missing	(1)	.2

APPENDIX 4

TABLE A.4.1.

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 1: SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: STATUS REPORT ON TENANT QUESTIONNAIRE FIELDWORK

COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	- TENANTS CONTACTED -		- TENANT RESPONSE -		TENANT REFUSALS						TENANT NON-RESPONSE			
		TOTAL CONTACTED	RATES BY TYPE	TOTAL INTERVIEWED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	TOTAL REFUSED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Refusal Rationale: Simple Refusals	Not Completed	Health Reasons	Language Difficulty	TOTAL NON-RESPONSE	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Rationale: Contacted, No Interview	Unlocatable
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	11.07%	56	84.85%	7	10.61%	3	0	0	4	3	.09	2	1
	Families	93	14.86%	86	92.47%	5	5.38%	3	0	1	1	2	.04	2	0
	Total	159	13.01%	142	89.31%	12	7.55%	6	0	1	5	5	.06	4	1
				142											
LONDON	Seniors	238	39.93%	191	80.25%	40	16.81%	27	3	5	5	7	.06	3	4
	Families	87	13.90%	73	83.91%	9	10.34%	8	0	1	0	5	.12	5	0
	Total	325	26.60%	264	81.23%	49	15.08%	35	3	6	5	12	.07	8	4
				264											
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	7.38%	35	79.55%	8	15.18%	4	0	4	0	1	.05	1	0
	Families	21	3.35%	18	85.71%	1	4.76%	1	0	0	0	2	.20	2	0
	Total	65	5.32%	53	81.54%	9	13.85%	5	0	4	0	3	.09	3	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	10.40%	52	83.87%	9	14.52%	2	0	4	3	1	.03	0	1
	Families	39	6.23%	35	89.74%	2	5.13%	1	0	0	1	2	.11	2	0
	Total	101	8.27%	87	86.14%	11	10.89%	3	0	4	4	3	.06	2	1
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	6.21%	30	81.08%	5	13.51%	3	0	2	0	2	.11	2	0
	Families	14	2.24%	13	92.86%	1	7.14%	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	4.17%	43	84.31%	6	11.76%	4	0	2	0	2	.08	2	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	5.54%	28	84.85%	4	12.12%	3	0	1	0	1	.06	1	0
	Families	40	6.39%	29	72.50%	7	~17.50%	5	0	2	0	4	.21	0	4
	Total	73	5.97%	57	78.08%	11	15.07%	8	0	3	0	5	.14	1	4
TORONTO	Seniors	15	2.52%	11	73.33%	3	20.00%	2	0	0	1	1	.14	1	0
	Families	96	15.34%	72	75.00%	14	14.58%	10	0	0	4	10	.21	10	0
	Total	111	9.08%	83	74.77%	17	15.32%	12	0	0	5	11	.20	11	0
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	3.69%	14	63.64%	6	27.27%	3	1	1	1	2	.19	2	0
	Families	110	17.57%	96	87.27%	3	2.73%	1	0	2	0	11	.20	11	0
	Total	132	10.80%	110	83.33%	9	6.82%	4	1	3	1	13	.20	13	0
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	.67%	4	100.00%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Families	21	3.35%	20	95.24%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	1	.10	1	0
	Total	25	2.05%	24	96.00%	0	.00%	0	0	0	0	1	.08	1	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	6.88%	34	82.93%	5	12.20%	2	0	2	1	2	.10	2	0
	Families	76	12.14%	60	78.95%	4	5.26%	1	0	1	2	12	.32	12	0
	Total	117	9.57%	94	80.34%	9	7.69%	3	0	3	3	14	.24	14	0
YORK	Seniors	34	5.70%	24	70.59%	7	20.59%	5	0	0	2	3	.18	3	0
	Families	29	4.63%	19	65.52%	9	31.03%	6	1	2	0	1	.07	1	0
	Total	63	5.16%	43	68.25%	16	25.40%	11	1	2	2	4	.13	4	0
TOTALS	SENIORS	596	48.77%	479	47.90%	94	63.09%	54	4	19	17	23	31.51%	17	6
	FAMILIES	626	51.23%	521	52.10%	55	36.91%	37	1	9	8	50	68.49%	46	4
	TOTAL	1222	100.00%	1000	100.00%	149	100.00%	91	5	28	25	73	100.00%	63	10
				Response Rates:		Refusal Rates:						Non-Response Rates:			
PER CENT	SENIORS	100.00%	-	80.37%	-	15.77%	-	9.06%	.67%	3.19%	2.85%	3.86%	-	2.85%	1.01%
	FAMILIES	100.00%	-	83.23%	-	8.79%	-	5.91%	.16%	1.44%	1.28%	7.99%	-	7.35%	.64%
	TOTAL	100.00%	-	81.83%	-	12.19%	-	7.45%	.41%	2.29%	2.05%	5.97%	-	5.16%	.82%

FINAL REPORT DATE: 1986/07/23

TABLE A.4.2

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 2: SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: TENANT HOUSEHOLDS EXCLUDED FROM THE SURVEY

COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	TOTAL				TENANT HOUSEHOLDS EXCLUDED FROM THE SURVEY						
		TENANTS CONTACTED	TENANTS INTERVIEWED	TENANTS REFUSED	NON-RESPONSE	TOTAL EXCLUDED	RATES BY COMMUNITY	Never Contacted	Not Eligible	Moved Out	Deceased	Don't Know
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	56	7	3	41	24.40%	37	2	0	0	2
	Families	93	86	5	2	32	14.41%	32	0	0	0	0
	Total	159	142	12	5	73	18.02%	69	2	0	0	2
LONDON	Seniors	238	191	40	7	57	33.93%	50	1	3	2	1
	Families	87	73	9	5	35	15.77%	35	0	0	0	0
	Total	325	264	49	12	92	22.72%	85	1	3	2	1
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	35	8	1	7	4.17%	6	0	0	1	0
	Families	21	18	1	2	4	1.80%	4	0	0	0	0
	Total	65	53	9	3	11	2.72%	10	0	0	1	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	52	9	1	22	13.10%	21	0	1	0	0
	Families	39	35	2	2	13	5.86%	13	0	0	0	0
	Total	101	87	11	3	35	8.64%	34	0	1	0	0
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	30	5	2	13	7.74%	12	0	0	1	0
	Families	14	13	1	0	8	3.60%	8	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	43	6	2	21	5.19%	20	0	0	1	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	28	4	1	11	6.55%	11	0	0	0	0
	Families	40	29	7	4	3	.00%	0	0	3	0	0
	Total	73	57	11	5	14	.00%	11	0	3	0	0
TORONTO	Seniors	15	11	3	1	4	2.38%	4	0	0	0	0
	Families	96	72	14	10	36	16.22%	36	0	0	0	0
	Total	111	83	17	11	42	10.37%	40	1	0	0	1
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	14	6	2	3	1.79%	3	0	0	0	0
	Families	110	96	3	11	43	19.37%	43	0	0	0	0
	Total	132	110	9	13	51	12.59%	46	1	3	0	1
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	4	0	0	3	1.79%	3	0	0	0	0
	Families	21	20	0	1	18	8.11%	18	0	0	0	0
	Total	25	24	0	1	21	5.19%	21	0	0	0	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	34	5	2	9	5.36%	7	0	1	1	0
	Families	76	60	4	12	24	10.81%	23	1	0	0	0
	Total	117	94	9	14	34	8.40%	30	1	1	1	1
YORK	Seniors	34	24	7	3	4	2.38%	4	0	0	0	0
	Families	29	19	9	1	7	3.15%	7	0	0	0	0
	Total	63	43	16	4	11	2.72%	11	0	0	0	0
TOTALS	SENIORS	596	479	94	23	168	41.48%	158	0	5	5	0
	FAMILIES	626	521	55	50	222	54.81%	219	0	3	0	0
	TOTAL	1222	1000	149	73	405	100.00%	377	6	11	5	6
PER CENT	SENIORS	100.00%	80.37%	15.77%	3.86%	100.00%	-	94.05%	.00%	2.98%	2.98%	.00%
	FAMILIES	100.00%	83.23%	8.79%	7.99%	100.00%	-	98.65%	.00%	1.35%	.00%	.00%
	TOTAL	100.00%	81.83%	12.19%	5.97%	100.00%	-	93.09%	1.48%	2.72%	1.23%	1.48%

NOTE: Households excluded are not included in the response, refusal or non-response totals or rates.

FINAL REPORT DATE: 1986/07/23

TABLE A.4.3

APPENDIX 4, TABLE 3: SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO: IN DEPTH ANALYSIS OF REFUSALS SEEKING REFUSALS FOR POTENTIAL MEDICAL REASONS

		TOTAL			TENANT RATIONALE TO INTERVIEWERS FOR SIMPLE REFUSALS											
												Potential Medical Refusals				
COMMUNITIES COMPRISING THE SAMPLE	TENANT HOUSEHOLD TYPES	TENANTS CONTACTED	INTERVIEWS COMPLETED	SIMPLE REFUSALS (Table 1)	Without Giving Reason	Wished Not To Answer	Denied Advance Notice	Not Interested	Bothered Enough	Not Using Any Services	Language Difficulty	Recent Death	Not Well	Hearing Difficulty	Too Tired	Too Personal
SUDBURY	Seniors	66	56	3	0	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	93	86	3	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	159	142	6	3	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
LONDON	Seniors	238	191	27	3	8	1	8	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	0
	Family	87	73	8	1	2	0	4	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0
	Total	325	264	35	4	10	1	12	2	2	0	1	1	1	1	0
BELLEVILLE	Seniors	44	35	4	0	1	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	21	18	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	65	53	5	0	2	0	3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ST. CATHARINES	Seniors	62	52	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	39	35	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	101	87	3	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
OWEN SOUND	Seniors	37	30	3	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	14	13	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	51	43	4	0	2	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
PETERBOROUGH	Seniors	33	28	3	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	40	29	5	1	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
	Total	73	57	8	1	1	0	3	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	1
TORONTO	Seniors	15	11	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	96	72	10	2	2	0	3	0	2	1	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	111	83	12	2	2	0	4	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0
NORTH YORK	Seniors	22	14	3	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	110	96	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	132	110	4	3	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
ETOBICOKE	Seniors	4	4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Family	21	20	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	25	24	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCARBOROUGH	Seniors	41	34	2	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	76	60	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
	Total	117	94	3	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0
YORK	Seniors	34	24	5	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	0
	Family	29	19	6	0	0	0	5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1
	Total	63	43	11	1	2	0	5	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
COLUMN TOTALS	Seniors	596	479	54	7	14	4	16	4	2	1	0	4	1	1	0
	Family	626	521	37	10	7	0	13	0	2	1	1	1	0	0	2
	Total	1222	1000	91	17	21	4	29	4	4	2	1	5	1	1	2
ROW PERCENTS	Seniors	100.00%	80.37%	100.00%	12.96%	25.93%	7.41%	29.63%	7.41%	3.70%	1.85%	.00%	7.41%	1.85%	1.85%	.00%
	Family	100.00%	83.23%	100.00%	27.03%	18.92%	.00%	35.14%	.00%	5.41%	2.70%	2.70%	2.70%	.00%	.00%	5.41%
	Total	100.00%	81.83%	100.00%	18.68%	23.08%	4.40%	31.87%	4.40%	4.40%	2.20%	1.10%	5.49%	1.10%	1.10%	2.20%
COLUMNS PERCENTS	Seniors	48.77%	5.40%	59.34%	41.18%	66.67%	100.00%	55.17%	100.00%	50.00%	50.00%	.00%	80.00%	100.00%	100.00%	.00%
	Family	51.23%	52.10%	40.66%	58.82%	33.33%	.00%	44.83%	.00%	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%	20.00%	.00%	.00%	100.00%
	Total	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%	100.00%

FINAL REPORT DATE: 86/07/23

TABLE A.4.4

APPENDIX 4: TABLE 4

SURVEY OF SUPPORT USE PATTERNS OF PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS IN ONTARIO
SUMMARY OF TENANT REFUSALS FOR POTENTIAL MEDICAL REASONS

TYPE OF TENANT	Sub Total From Apendix 5 Table 1	Sub Total From Apendix 5 Table 3	TOTAL POTENTIAL MEDICAL REFUSALS
Seniors	19	6	25
Families	9	4	13
TOTAL	28	10	38

POTENTIAL MEDICAL REFUSALS include Health Reasons, from Table 1, and from Table 3: Recent Death, Not Well, Hearing Difficulty, Too Tired and Questions Too Personal.

The tenants who displayed potential medical refusals were analysed to determine whether their refusal and age were related. No such relationships were found.

Tables in Appendix 5 have been prepared by Brenda Massey, Brenda Stewart and George Hough.

FINAL REPORT DATE: 86/08/18

APPENDIX 5

I.D. ____________

FAMILY QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

I.D. ________

COMMUNITY AGENCY CARD

Agencies Respondent Uses (Please Check)	Refer to:	
	Q.3	Q.4

FAMILY QUESTIONNAIRE

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

NAME: ______________________________________

ADDRESS: ____
(Street Name and No.) (Unit No.) (City or Borough)

TELEPHONE: ______________________

RECORD OF VISITS

		APPOINTMENT MADE		LENGTH OF INTERVIEW		Result of Call
	Date	Date	Time	Start	Finished	
1st Call						
2nd Call						
3rd Call						
4th Call						
5th Call						

INTERVIEWER: VERIFY TELEPHONE NUMBER IN CASE CALL-BACKS ARE REQUIRED.

FINAL RESULT

1. Completed
2. Semi-Completed
3. Refused
4. Not at home
5. Ill or infirm
6. Other (SPECIFY) ________________

NAME OF INTERVIEWER:

ID OF RESPONDENT:

INTRODUCTION

Hello, my name is_________. We are conducting a study of tenant needs for the Ontario government. Did you receive our letter?

The purpose of the study is to increase our understanding as to how families in assisted housing find help for the kinds of needs that all people have from time to time.

(INTERVIEWER: DO NOT READ UNLESS RESPONDENT REQUESTS INFORMATION ABOUT CONTENTS OF QUESTIONNAIRE.)

The questionnaire involves a number of questions about families and children, health and matters affecting health, social activities, social services, how members of the family get along, economic and related matters.

The interview is strictly confidential, and YOUR ANSWERS WILL NEVER BE SEEN BY ANYONE OTHER THAN OUR RESEARCHERS. NO ONE WILL SEE YOUR ANSWERS, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES THAT HAVE HIRED US TO DO THE SURVEY.

First, I would like to ask you some questions about yourself, your apartment, and your living arrangements.

1.1 Are there any of your children or other dependents aged 24 years or under who live here with you?

1. Yes
2. No (INTERVIEWER: IF NO, END INTERVIEW)

1.2 How many years have you lived in this neighbourhood?
_____ (Years)

1.3 Could you tell me approximately what year you moved to this project? (PROBE)
_____ (Year)

1.4 Do you and/or your spouse or other adult living here have a motor vehicle for transportation?

1. Yes (specify number of vehicles and who owns each)
   ____
   ____
2. No

2.0 Next I would like to ask you about some social and family activities that you may do.

2.1 Do you have any children living elsewhere (daughters or sons)?

1. Yes (IF YES) How many sons? ____ (Number)
How many daughters? ____ (Number)
2. No

2.2 Do you have any other relatives living elsewhere?

1. Yes
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO CHILDREN OR OTHER RELATIVES GO TO Q.2.8)

2.3 Where do the children/and/or relatives that you can depend on live?

Do you have children and/or other relatives:	How many Children?	Other Relatives? (Yes/No)	
(a) In the building?	______	1	2
(b) In the surrounding neighbourhood?	______	1	2
(c) In the city or community outside of the neighbourhood?	______	1	2
(d) Outside the city or community?	______	1	2

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO CHILDREN GO TO Q.2.6)

2.4 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	4 Times a Week or More
(a) Talk on the phone with your children?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your children in their homes?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your children come to visit you here?	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.5 Do you now see more of your children, less, or about the same, as you did five years ago?

1. More (PROBE WHY)________________________________

2. About the same

3. Less (PROBE WHY)________________________________

(IF RESPONDENT HAS NO OTHER RELATIVES, GO TO Q2.8)

2.6 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	4 Times a Week or More
(a) Talk on the phone with your other close relatives	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your close relatives in their homes	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your close relatives come to visit you here	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.7 Do you now see more of your close relatives (other than children), less, or about the same, as you did five years ago?

1. More (PROBE WHY) ___________________________________
2. About the same
3. Less (PROBE WHY)___________________________________

2.8 Do you have any close friends that you can depend on: (IF NO GO TO 2.10) (ASK FOR EACH LOCATION)

	Yes	No
(a) In the building?	1	2
(b) In the surrounding neighbourhood?	1	2
(c) In the city or community outside of the neighbourhood?	1	2
(d) Outside the city or community?	1	2

(IF NO FRIENDS GIVEN GO TO 2.10)

2.9 How often do you:

	Never	Once a Month or Less	2 or 3 Times a Month	Once a Week	2 or 3 Times a Week	Nearly Every Day
(a) Talk on the phone with your friends?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Go to see your friends in their home?	0	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Have your friends come to visit you here?	0	1	2	3	4	5

2.10 Starting with yourself, could you tell me about the people who normally live in your household, their sex, age, and relationship to you? (LIST EACH PERSON, SEX, AGE AND RELATIONSHIP TO RESPONDENT) (PROBE - IS THERE ANYONE ELSE?)

Can you tell me what each person usually does during weekdays, whether they stay home, work, go to school, day care, or something else? (PROBE FOR PART TIME ACTIVITIES AND COMBINATIONS)

(IF SCHOOL, WHAT GRADE IS ---------- IN?)

Person	Name	Sex	Year of Birth	Relationship to Respondent	Weekday Activity, Work, Education, etc.	Gr. in School/ Year in University
1 Respondent						
2						
3						
4						
5						
6						
7						
8						
9						
10						

(PROBE - IS THAT EVERYONE WHO LIVES HERE?) (IF MORE THAN 10 PERSONS IN HOUSEHOLD, RECORD ALL INFORMATION BELOW. (IF SPOUSE/FRIEND IN RESIDENCE, GO TO PART 3)

(IF NO SPOUSE/FRIEND IN RESIDENCE ASK):

2.11 Do you have a boyfriend (girlfriend) that you regard as "like a member of your family", or whom you see very regularly? (CIRCLE YES OR NO)

1. Yes
2. No (GO TO PART 2)

2.12 When was he/she born? _____ (Year)

2.13 What does he/she normally do during the week - work, go to school, or something else?

____
(PROBE FOR PART TIME ACTIVITIES AND COMBINATIONS)

3.0 Now we would like to talk to you about whether you are getting help for the kinds of needs that all people have from time to time.

First I will ask you about a number of things that people sometimes have difficulty with.

Then I will ask you some questions about any help or services you may be getting.

INTERVIEWER: NOTE THAT THE SAME QUESTIONS ARE ASKED BELOW FOR EACH OF EIGHT ACTIVITIES. FOR EACH QUESTION, THE OBJECTIVE IS TO: (A) IDENTIFY NEED FOR HELP; (B) IDENTIFY IF HELP WAS RECEIVED; AND (C) ASK A NUMBER OF SUB QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT HELP. NOTE THAT MAIN SKIPS ON THE GRID ARE DOWN FOR EACH TYPE OF HELP, AND THEN ACROSS TO ASK ABOUT THE HELP RECEIVED FOR EACH SOURCE. REMEMBER_TO_RECORD_ALL_COMMUNITY_AGENCY_AND_PROJECT_STAFF HELP_ON_THE_AGENCY_CARD.

3.1 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had doing heavy cleaning? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.1.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.2)

3.1.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.1.b In the past year have you ever had help with doing heavy cleaning?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.1.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.2)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.2)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.2)

3.1.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.1.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.1.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.1.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.1.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from ______? (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.1.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.1.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.1.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.1.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.2 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had shopping for groceries? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.2.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.3)

3.2.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.2.b In the past year have you ever had help with shopping for groceries?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.2.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.3)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.3)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.3)

3.2.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.2.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.2.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.2.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.2.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.2.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.2.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.2.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.2.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.3 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had managing the family budget and making ends meet? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.3.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.4)

3.3.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.3.b In the past year have you ever had help with managing the family budget and making ends meet?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.3.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.4)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.4)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.4)

3.3.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP. "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.3.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.3.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.3.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.3.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from ______?
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.3.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going, regular	2	2	2
On-going, occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.3.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.3.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.3.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.4 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had getting around the community on your own? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.4.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.5)

3.4.a What was this difficulty?

3.4.b In the past year have you ever had help with getting around the community?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.4.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.5)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.5)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.5)

3.4.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.4.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.4.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ---
2. ---
3. ---

3.4.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.4.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	----- Source 1	----- Source 2	----- Source 3

3.4.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.4.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.4.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.4.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.5 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had dealing with problems or crises for yourself or other adult family members (e.g. personal difficulties or worries, emotional problems or other emergencies.) Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.5.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.6)

3.5.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.5.b In the past year have you ever had help with dealing with problems or crises?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.5.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.6)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)
Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.6)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.6)

3.5.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.5.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.5.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.5.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.5.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_ (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.5.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.5.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.5.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ___________________	8	8	8

3.5.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.6 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had dealing with your child/ children's emotional and behaviour problems? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.6.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.7)

3.6.a What was this difficulty?

3.6.b In the past year have you ever had help with your child/children's emotional or behaviour problems?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.6.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.7)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.7)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.7)

3.6.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.6.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.6.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. --
2. --
3. --

3.6.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.6.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.6.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.6.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.6.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.6.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.7 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had with child rearing and parenting generally? (KNOWING WHAT TO DO) Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.7.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.8)

3.7.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.7.b In the past year have you ever had help with child rearing and parenting generally?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.7.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.8)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.8)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.8)

3.7.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.7.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.7.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.7.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.7.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_ (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.7.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.7.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.7.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.7.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.8 (IF NO CHILDREN UNDER 12, GO TO Q.3.10)
Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had in providing regular or occasional child care for your child/children under 12? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.8.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.9)

3.8.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.8.b In the past year have you ever had help with regular or occasional child care?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.8.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.9)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)
Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.9)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.9)

3.8.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.8.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.8.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.8.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.8.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from ______? (PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____

3.8.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.8.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.8.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.8.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.9 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had with providing for recreation and other leisure activities for your child/children under 12? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.9.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.10)

3.9.a What was this difficulty?

____

3.9.b In the past year have you ever had help with providing for recreation and other leisure activities?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.9.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.10)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)

Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.10)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

____
(GO TO Q.3.10)

3.9.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.9.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.9.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

3.9.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.9.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____	_____	_____
	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3

3.9.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.9.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.9.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) --------------------	8	8	8

3.9.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.10 Thinking generally of how things have been for you in the past year, how much difficulty have you personally had with getting information about government or community programs or services or any other help you might need (COMMUNITY SERVICES, DAY CARE)? Would you say:

1. No difficulty (GO TO Q.3.10.b)
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Could not do at all by yourself
5. (Does not normally carry out this activity...GO TO Q.3.11)

3.10.a What was this difficulty?

3.10.b In the past year have you ever had help with getting information about government or community services?

1. Yes - (GO TO Q.3.10.c)
2. No

(IF RESPONDENT HAD NO DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP GO TO Q.3.11)
(IF RESPONDENT HAD DIFFICULTY AND NO HELP ASK:)
Could you have used some help?

1. No (GO TO Q.3.11)
2. Yes...Why aren't you getting help?

(GO TO Q.3.11)

3.10.c Who gave you this help? (CIRCLE CODES TO INDICATE EACH TYPE AND PROBE FOR OTHER HELP, "IS THERE ANYONE ELSE (OR ANY OTHER AGENCY) WHO HELPED YOU WITH...?" NOTE DETAILS) RECORD ANY AGENCIES USED ON AGENCY CARD.

	Source 1	Source 2	Source 3
Spouse/Housemate	1	1	1
Children	2	2	2
Other Family	3	3	3
Friend/Neighbour	4	4	4
Project Staff	5	5	5
Community Agency	6	6	6
Other	7	7	7

3.10.d Do they (REFER TO SOURCE OF HELP) live:

In your unit	1	1	1
In your Bldg/Project	2	2	2
Outside of your Bldg/Project	3	3	3

3.10.e What kind of help did they give you:

1. --
2. --
3. --

3.10.f In the past year, how often did you receive this help? Would you say:

4 times a wk or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5
Other (SPECIFY)	6	6	6

3.10.g How long would you estimate you received (or have been getting) this help from _____?_
(PLEASE RECORD EXACT NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS OR YEARS/OR EXACT DATES)

Number of days, weeks months/or Dates	_____ Source 1	_____ Source 2	_____ Source 3

3.10.h (INTERVIEWER PROBE THEN CODE IF HELP WAS...)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

3.10.i Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

3.10.j How did you arrange for this help or service?

Myself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

3.10.k Without help from (each source) would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

3.11 Is your family's ability to do things for yourselves now better, about the same or not as good as it was five years ago (or for the time this family has been together)?

1. Better
2. About the same
3. Not as good

4.0 We would like to talk with you about the services provided by organizations you may have already used and some services which might be of use to you.
(INTERVIEWER: WHILE PROCEEDING, PLEASE CHECK OFF THE SERVICES THAT THE RESPONDENT HAS ALREADY INDICATED RECEIVING IN THE QUESTIONNAIRE, MAKING REFERENCE TO THE COMMUNITY AGENCY CARD AND NOTING RELEVANT QUESTION NUMBER.)

4.1 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Health Services (doctors, hosp. other med. clinic)	**School Social Workers**	**Homemaker Service**
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.2)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.2)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
   ____
2. ____________________
   ____
3. ____________________
   ____

4.1.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.1.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.1.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.1.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.1.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.1.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.1.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.1.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.1.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.2 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Mental Health Services for Adults	Children's Mental Health Service	Pre-school Child Day-Care Programs
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.3)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.3)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
   ____
2. ____________________
   ____
3. ____________________
   ____

4.2.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.2.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.2.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.2.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.2.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.2.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.2.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.2.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.2.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.3 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Before and After school child care program	**Police**	**Children's Aid Society**
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.4)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.4)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________

____

2. ____________________

____

3. ____________________

____

4.3.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.3.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.3.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.3.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.3.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.3.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.3.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.3.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.3.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Parenting Education	**Family Planning (birth control) Service**	**Family Counselling Service**
4.4 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.5)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.5)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.4.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.4.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.4.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.4.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.4.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.4.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.4.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.4.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.4.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Big Brothers Big Sisters	Credit/ Budget Counselling	Job Counselling
4.5 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.6)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.6)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.5.a Who was the help/service for?			
Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.5.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.5.c Where did you receive this help?			
In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.5.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.5.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.5.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.5.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.5.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.5.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.6 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Educational Upgrading Program	**Nutrition Counselling Service**	**Alcohol and Drug Counselling Service**
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.7)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.7)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.6.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.6.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.6.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.6.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.6.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

____	____	____
SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.6.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.6.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.6.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) -------------------------	8	8	8

4.6.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.7 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)

	Community Information & Referral Services	**Counselling on Family Law Matters (Child support, divorce)**	**Housing Project Staff (CRW or others, specify)**
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.8)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.8)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/ service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
   ____
2. ____________________
   ____
3. ____________________
   ____

4.7.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.7.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.7.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.7.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.7.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

____	____	____
SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.7.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.7.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.7.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.7.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Family Benefits Workers	Other Income Maintenance	Recreational/ Community Drop-in Centres
4.8 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.9)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR	1	1	1
No ... Q.4.9)	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
____
2. ____________________
____
3. ____________________
____

4.8.a Who was the help/service for?

Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.8.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.8.c Where did you receive this help?

In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.8.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.8.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

	____	____	____
	SOURCE1	SOURCE2	SOURCE3

4.8.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.8.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.8.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ______________________	8	8	8

4.8.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

	Other Types of Services	**Other Types of Services**	**Other Types of Services**
4.9 In the past year have you or any family member ever received help from: (READ TYPE OF AGENCY/SERVICE)			
Yes, as noted in previous charts (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR 4.10)	1	1	1
Yes, noted here	2	2	2
No...Have you ever heard of (MENTION SERVICE)	3	3	3
Yes... (GO TO NEXT SERVICE OR Q.4.10)	1	1	1
No ...	2	2	2

(IF YES) What kind of help/service was that? (SPECIFY SOURCE OF HELP AND KIND OF SERVICE: PROBE FOR ALL DETAILS: THEN ASK A - H QUESTIONS)

1. ____________________
   ____
2. ____________________
   ____
3. ____________________
   ____

4.9.a Who was the help/service for?			
Self	1	1	1
Spouse/housemate	2	2	2
Child	3	3	3
Other (SPECIFY):	4	4	4

4.9.b Why did you get this help?

1. ____
2. ____
3. ____

4.9.c Where did you receive this help?			
In Unit	1	1	1
In building/project	2	2	2
Out of building/project	3	3	3

4.9.d In the past year, how often did you receive this help/service? (CIRCLE ONE)

4 times a week or more	1	1	1
2 or 3 times a week	2	2	2
Once a week	3	3	3
1 to 3 times a month	4	4	4
Less than once a month	5	5	5

4.9.e How long would you estimate you have received or have been getting this help from _______?

(PROBE NUMBER OF DAYS, WEEKS, MONTHS AND DATES IF POSSIBLE)

4.9.f (INTERVIEWER PROBE AND CODE IF HELP/SERVICE WAS:)

	____ SOURCE1	____ SOURCE2	____ SOURCE3
Once	1	1	1
On-going,regular	2	2	2
On-going,occassional	3	3	3
Time-limited	4	4	4

4.9.g Did you receive enough help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

Was it the right kind of help?

Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2

4.9.h How did you arrange for this service?

Yourself	1	1	1
CRW	2	2	2
Public health nurse	3	3	3
Physician	4	4	4
Community group	5	5	5
Residential council	6	6	6
Relatives	7	7	7
Other (SPECIFY) ____________________	8	8	8

4.9.i Without this help/service, would you have been able to get by with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

With no difficulty	1	1	1
A little difficulty	2	2	2
A lot of difficulty	3	3	3
Not at all	4	4	4

4.10 During the last year have any agencies with legal authority, like the Children's Aid Society or the police required you to have their services?

1. Yes (IF YES) Specify which agencies

____

____

2. No

(INTERVIEWER: IF YES, GO BACK TO "OTHER" SECTIONS AND ASK SUB QUESTIONS IF DATA NOT CAPTURED PREVIOUSLY.

4.11 Thinking of all the things we've been discussing, are there any other services or help you or your spouse/housemate have needed, in the past year, but haven't been able to get or haven't asked for?

1. Yes
2. No (GO TO Q.5.0)

A. What did you need help with? (INSERT BELOW UNDER 'PROBLEM', THEN PROBE). Any other things you needed help with? (LIST AND ASK B AND C FOR EACH PROBLEM).

B. Why didn't you get this help you needed? (PROBE FOR ADDITIONAL REASONS).

(INSERT THESE CODES IN CHART BELOW):

1. Not aware of service
2. Service not available
3. Not sure what kind of service would help
4. Wouldn't ask for help
5. Cost too high
6. Not eligible
7. On waiting list
8. Inconvenient hours
9. Don't want
10. Lack of transportation
11. Service inappropriate
12. Difficult to get help on weekends
13. Other (specify):_______________________________

____

C. Have you been able to get along without such service, with no difficulty, a little difficulty, a lot of difficulty, or not at all?

(USE THESE CODES):

1. With no difficulty
2. A little difficulty
3. A lot of difficulty
4. Not at all

A: PROBLEMS FOR WHICH NEEDS WERE NOT MET	B: REASON NOT GETTING HELP	C: HOW WELL GOT ALONG WITHOUT SERVICE

5.0 Now I would like to ask you some questions about problems that many people with families encounter, and what you would do if you needed help for these types of problems. (INTERVIEWER: FOR ALL 5.0 TO 5.7, IF MORE THAN ONE SOURCE OF HELP IN A SINGLE CATEGORY IS IDENTIFIED RANK 1 AND 2 AND 3 ETC. CIRCLE WHERE LOCATED. DO NOT PROBE FOR MORE THAN ONE SOURCE, BUT CODE IF GIVEN.)

5.1 If you had to find someone to take care of your children for an hour (e.g. to run an important errand). Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
---------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.2 If you had to find someone to take care of or keep an eye on your children for a week (e.g. to go on an important trip). Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
---------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.3 If you needed help to go regularly for several weeks to a place that was hard to get to (e.g. hospital, temporary job or something else you had to do), and you couldn't drive yourself, take a taxi, or get there by transit. Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.4 If you needed to cover a large expense, say $200 or more (e.g. for a loan payment, car repairs, car insurance, etc.), and you didn't have it. Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.5 If you were really feeling bored or lonely and wanted to talk to someone. Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
--------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.6 If you were really depressed about some serious problem and needed someone to listen for a few hours. Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
--------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.7 If you felt you needed advice on some aspect of how to deal with your children. Whom would you most likely turn to? Would this person/agency providing help be in or outside the building or project?

	In Unit	In Project/ Building	Out
(a) ___ Friend	1	2	3
(b) ___ Neighbour	1	2	3
(c) ___ Spouse/Boy/Girl friend	1	2	3
(d) ___ Children	1	2	3
(e) ___ Other family	1	2	3
(f) ___ Building or project staff	1	2	3
(g) ___ Public or community agency	1	2	3
(h) ___ Other (specify)			
--------------------------	1	2	3
(i) ___ Don't know			
(j) ___ No one			

5.8 Often people give things they no longer need to friends, family and neighbours who may have a use for them. Now thinking of the past year or so, is there anyone that you received the following from? (FIRST, ASK ITEM (a); THEN ASK: Who is that? DO they live in the building/project? REPEAT FOR (b) AND (c).

			Who do you receive from			Do they live in the building?		
	Yes	No	Friends	Relatives	Community Services	Build.	Project	Out
(a) Clothes for children or adults	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3
(b) Furniture or household equipment for your home	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3
(c) Anything else (SPECIFY) ------------------	1	2	1	2	3	1	2	3

6.0 Now, I would like to ask you a few questions about your general health and medical services you may use.

6.1 Do you have a particular family doctor whom you call when you need medical care for yourself, your children or your spouse/friend (IF APPLICABLE)

1. Yes
2. No (IF NO) What do you do if you need medical help? (CHECK EACH THAT APPLIES)
    1. Go to emergency at hospital
    2. Go to clinic
    3. Other (SPECIFY) ______________________

6.1.a When was the last time you visited a medical doctor about your or your family's health?

1. Less than one year (PROBE FOR HOW LONG AGO) __________ MONTHS
2. More than one year

6.2 Do you or anyone in your family have any health conditions or any disabilities?

1. Yes (GO TO Q.6.3)
2. No (GO TO Q.6.4)

6.3 What health conditions or disabilities does each have? (PROBE FOR ALL HEALTH CONDITIONS AND DISABILITIES AND FOR WHICH FAMILY MEMBER INCLUDING SELF, THEN FOR EACH, ASK): How much does this interfere with your daily activities? Does it interfere not at all, a little, a lot or a great deal? (CIRCLE ONE FOR EACH CONDITION)

Person	Conditions(s)	Not At All	A Little	A Great Deal
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3
		1	2	3

6.4 Over the last twelve months, have you had any of the following problems?
What about: (READ AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

		YES	NO
A.	Problems with your budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2
D.	Depression	1	2
E.	Other problems with your health	1	2
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2
H.	Accidental injury to yourself or someone else	1	2
I.	Violent injury to yourself or someone else	1	2
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2

Now I would like to ask you some questions about the use of alcohol as it is one aspect of health.

6.5 On average, over the last 12 months, about how many drinks of beer, wine, liquor or any other alcoholic beverage have you taken? Would this be:

1. None (GO TO 6.7)
2. Once a month or less
3. 1 or 2 drinks a week
4. 1 or 2 drinks a day
5. 3 - 6 drinks a day
6. More than six drinks a day

6.6 (IF PROBLEM(S) MENTIONED IN 6.4 ASK FOR EACH PROBLEM CIRCLED.)
(IF NO PROBLEMS MENTIONED GO TO 6.7)

Over the last twelve months, do you feel your drinking played a part in your:

		YES	NO	N/A
A.	Problems with your budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2	3
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2	3
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2	3
D.	Depression	1	2	3
E.	Other problems with your health	1	2	3
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2	3
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2	3
H.	Accidental injury to yourself or someone else	1	2	3
I.	Violent injury to yourself or someone else	1	2	3
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2	3
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3

6.7 Has use of drugs, medicine or substances (like glue) ever caused any problems?

1. No
2. Yes, medicine
3. Yes, drugs or other substances

6.7.a (IF PROBLEMS MENTIONED IN 6.4 ASK FOR EACH PROBLEM MENTIONED)
(IF NO PROBLEMS MENTIONED GO TO 6.8)

Over the last twelve months, do you feel that this has played a part in:

		YES	NO	N/A
A.	Problems with your budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2	3
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2	3
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2	3
D.	Depression	1	2	3
E.	Other problems with your health	1	2	3
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2	3
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2	3
H.	Accidental injury to yourself or someone else	1	2	3
I.	Violent injury to yourself or someone else	1	2	3
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2	3
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3

(IF NO SPOUSE/FRIEND GO TO CHILDREN SECTION, Q.6.12)

6.8 Over the last twelve months has your spouse/friend had any of the following problems?

		YES	NO
A.	Problems with the budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2
D.	Depression	1	2
E.	Other problems with his/her health	1	2
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2
H.	Accidental injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2
I.	Violent injury to him/herself or someone else	1	2
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2

6.9 On average, over the last 12 months, about how many drinks of beer, wine, liquor or any other alcoholic beverage would your spouse/friend take? Would you say: (READ CHOICES AND CIRCLE ONE)

1. None (GO TO 6.11)
2. Once a month or less
3. 1 or 2 drinks a week
4. 1 or 2 drinks a day
5. 3 - 6 drinks a day
6. More than six drinks a day

6.10 (IF PROBLEMS MENTIONED IN 6.8, ASK FOR EACH PROBLEM CIRCLED.)
(IF NO PROBLEMS MENTIONED GO TO 6.11a)

Over the last 12 months, do you feel his/her drinking played a part in:

		YES	NO	N/A
A.	Problems with the budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2	3
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2	3
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2	3
D.	Depression	1	2	3
E.	Other problems with his/her health	1	2	3
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2	3
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2	3
H.	Accidental injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2	3
I.	Violent injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2	3
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2	3
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) __________________	1	2	3

6.11.a Has use of drugs, medicines or substances (like glue) ever caused any problems for him/her?

1. No (GO TO Q.6.12)
2. Yes, medicine
3. Yes, drugs or other substances

6.11.b (IF PROBLEM MENTIONED IN 6.8, ASK FOR EACH PROBLEM CIRCLED.) (IF NO PROBLEMS MENTIONED, GO TO 6.12)

Over the last twelve months, do you feel his/her use of drugs, medicines or other substances ever played a part in:

		YES	NO	N/A
A.	Problems with the budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2	3
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2	3
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2	3
D.	Depression	1	2	3
E.	Other problems with his/her health	1	2	3
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2	3
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2	3
H.	Accidental injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2	3
I.	Violent injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2	3
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2	3
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3

6.12 Over the last twelve months, have any of your children (has your child) had any of the following problems?

		YES	NO
A.	Problems with the budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2
D.	Depression	1	2
E.	Other problems with his/her health	1	2
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2
H.	Accidental injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2
I.	Violent injury to yourself or someone else	1	2
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2

6.13 Over the last 12 months, have you had concerns about drugs, alcohol or other substances (like glue) used by your children?

1. Yes
2. No (GO TO 6.15)

6.14 (IF PROBLEM(S) MENTIONED IN 6.12, ASK FOR EACH PROBLEM CIRCLED.)
(IF NO PROBLEMS MENTIONED GO TO 6.15.)

Over the last 12 months, do you feel this played a part in:
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY AND PROBE FOR CAUSE OF PROBLEMS)

		ALCOHOL	DRUGS,	NO	N/A
A.	Problems with the budget or other things (e.g. rent, food)	1	2	3	4
B.	Difficulties with driving	1	2	3	4
C.	Trouble at work or school	1	2	3	4
D.	Depression	1	2	3	4
E.	Other problems with his/her health	1	2	3	4
F.	Tension or disagreement with family or friends	1	2	3	4
G.	Trouble with a superintendent, manager or housing authority	1	2	3	4
H.	Accidental injury to his/herself or someone else	1	2	3	4
I.	Violent injury to yourself or someone else	1	2	3	4
J.	Trouble with the law	1	2	3	4
K.	Any other problems (SPECIFY) ____________________	1	2	3	4
L.	None of these				

6.15 Please indicate which of the following happened to you in the last twelve months. You may already have indicated some of these events to me but it is important that I ask them to be sure. (READ ALL AND CIRCLE YES OR NO)

	Yes	No
(a) Stopped full-time schooling	1	2
(b) Lost job, or was unemployed	1	2
(c) Got married	1	2
(d) Someone moved in with you	1	2
(e) Had financial problems	1	2
(f) You and your spouse/partner separated	1	2
(g) Arrival of a baby at home	1	2
(h) Someone moved out of your home	1	2
(i) Serious illness	1	2
(j) Serious illness of someone dear	1	2
(k) Quit or retired from full-time work	1	2
(l) Started working or changed jobs	1	2
(m) Death of someone dear	1	2
(n) Problems with the law (e.g. charged with offense)	1	2

7.0 Now I would like to ask you some questions about your satisfaction with your family relationships here. (INTERVIEWER: CLARIFY, REFERS TO THIS FAMILY, NOT OTHER PARENTS LIVING ELSEWHERE)

(FOR THOSE RESPONDENTS WHO HAVE NO SPOUSE/FRIEND, GO TO Q.7.3)

7.1 How often do you and your spouse/friend do things together. (INTERVIEWER: REASSURE RESPONDENT: THESE ARE PERSONAL QUESTIONS BUT WE ARE ASKING THEM TO BETTER UNDERSTAND THE FAMILY SITUATION)

How often do you and your spouse/friend:

	Once or More a Day	2-6 Times A Week	About Once A Week	2-4 Times A Month	About Once a A Month	Less than Once a A Month	Never (DO NOT READ)
(a) Do things together for enjoyment?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(b) Show signs that you care for each other?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(c) Quarrel	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7.2 Overall, how would you rate your relationship with your spouse/friend? Would this be:

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

(INTERVIEWER: IF SINGLE PARENT WITH ALL CHILDREN UNDER AGE 4, GO TO Q.7.4)

7.3 I am going to read some statements about families and family relationships. For each one, could you tell me if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the way it describes your family here in this apartment/house.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
(a) Planning family activities is difficult because we misunderstand each other	1	2	3	4
(b) In times of crisis we can turn to each other for support	1	2	3	4
(c) We avoid discussing our fears and concerns	1	2	3	4
(d) Making decisions is a problem for our family	1	2	3	4
(e) We don't get along well together	1	2	3	4
(f) We confide in each other	1	2	3	4

(INTERVIEWER THIS QUESTION RELATES TO CURRENT RELATIONSHIPS WITHIN THE FAMILY)

7.4 Taking all things together, would you say that you are very satisfied with your current family situation (relationships) here, satisfied, not too satisfied, or not satisfied at all?

1. Very satisfied
2. Satisfied
3. Not too satisfied
4. Not satisfied at all

7.5 How would you describe your relationship with your child/children? (READ AND CIRCLE ONE)

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

7.6 How often do you and your child/children:
(READ EACH OF A AND B)

	Once or More A Day	2-6 Times A Week	About Once A Week	2-4 Times A Month	About Once a A Month	Less than Once a A Month	Never
(a) Do things together for enjoyment?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
(b) Show signs that you care for each other?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7.7 Right now, regarding your children, what would you say you worry about most?

(SPECIFY):

____

____

____

____

7.8 Is/are your child/children doing as well at school as you would like?

1. Yes
2. No (IF NO) Why not?

____

____

(ASK IF SPOUSE OR FRIEND)

7.9 In general, how would you describe the relationship between your spouse/friend and your child/children?

1. Excellent
2. Good
3. Fair
4. Poor

8.0 We would like to have some idea how people manage financially since that is an important part of family life.

8.1 Approximately how much is your total household monthly income?
(INTERVIEWER: CHECK THAT A TOTAL INCLUDES ALL SOURCES OF INCOME FROM ALL HOUSEHOLD MEMBERS)

$ __________

8.2 How often do you have difficulty finding enough money each month for example to buy food and pay rent? Would this be:

1. Rarely
2. Occasionally
3. Regularly or
4. Never

9.0 Now I would like to ask you some questions about your family's education and experience in the work force.

9.1 What is the highest grade of school (or equivalent) that you ever completed?

__________ (Grade)

9.2 Do you have:

(a) High School diploma?

1. Yes
2. No

(b) Any years of education at university or community college?

1. Yes (specify type and years):____________________
2. No (Go to Q9.3)

(c) University degree or other certificate?

1. Yes (specify type and years): ____________________

9.3 Are you employed at the moment? (Not including housework and other work around your home).

1. Employed full-time (Go to Q9.5)
2. Employed part-time (less than 30 hours per week) (Go to Q9.5)
3. Laid off or on maternity leave (Go to Q9.5)
4. Disability (Ask Q9.4, then Go to Q9.5)
5. Not working right now (Ask Q9.4, then Go to Q9.5)

9.4 Would you like to be employed full-time, part-time or not at all?

1. Full-time
2. Part-time
3. Not at all (specify why):

____

(IF NO SPOUSE/FRIEND, GO TO Q10.1)

9.5 What is the highest grade of school (or equivalent) that your spouse/friend ever completed?

_______________________ (Grade)

9.6 INTERVIEWER: REFER BACK TO HOUSEHOLD COMPOSITION GRID AND LIST NAMES OF CHILDREN AGE 14 OR OLDER NOT IN SCHOOL IN ITEM "(a)" THEN ASK (b) THROUGH (g) FOR EACH AS IT APPLIES. IF NO CHILDREN AGE 14 OR OLDER, GO TO Q.10.1

(a) Names of children age 14+ not in school	--------	--------	--------
(b) What is highest grade of school or equivalent completed	-------- (GRADE)	-------- (GRADE)	-------- (GRADE)
(c) Do they have:			
i. a high school diploma?			
Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2
ii. Any years of education at university or community college?			
Yes	1	1	1
No (GO TO Q.9.6.d)	2	2	2
iii. University degree or other certificate?			
Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2
(d) Does he/she have plans to take any further training or educational courses?			
Yes	1	1	1
No	2	2	2
(e) IF YES, Specify type and when	--------	--------	---------
(f) Is he/she employed full-time part-time or not at all now?			
Full-time	1	1	1
Part-time	2	2	2
Not at all	3	3	3

(g) IF UNEMPLOYED, When did he/she last work? (PROBE EXACT DATE)	--------	--------	--------
(h) What, if anything, would help him/her find employment or better employment? (READ AND CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)			
Educational upgrading	1	1	1
Classes to improve English	2	2	2
Training courses leading to a certificate, that might take as long as 1 year (such as for a job as a childcare worker, draftsperson, bookkeeper, truck driver, computer operator, etc.)	3	3	3
Training courses leading to a diploma, that might take as long as 3 years, like a chef, legal secretary,etc.	4	4	4
On the job training	5	5	5
Help in searching for a job	6	6	6
Student loans, grants and awards	7	7	7
Counselling on jobs and training	8	8	8
Other (SPECIFY)	9	9	9

Which of the things you have mentioned would help him/her the most? (SPECIFY)	--------	--------	------------

10.1 Were you born in Canada?

1. Yes
2. No   Where were you born? ___________________

When did you come to Canada? ___________

10.2 What language do you use all or most of the time?

1. English
2. French
3. Other (specify): ______________________________

11.1 What (if anything) do you feel the local housing authority should do to improve things in this project? (SPECIFY):

____

____

____

____

11.2 Do you have any other comments about your situation which you would like to make?

____

____

____

____

Thank you for your help and assistance with this important study.

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FRONT LINE STAFF
OF HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICE AND OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES
WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH TARGET HOUSING PROJECTS

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF
SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR FRONT LINE STAFF OF HEALTH, SOCIAL SERVICE AND OTHER COMMUNITY AGENCIES WHO ARE FAMILIAR WITH TARGET HOUSING PROJECTS

A STUDY OF THE NEED AND USE PATTERNS OF SUPPORT SERVICES AMONG PUBLIC HOUSING TENANTS

This questionnaire relates to your own knowledge regarding the following public housing project and the community services that are provided to that project. We will refer to this project from time to time as THE FOCUS HOUSING PROJECT.

Project Name: ______________________________

Project Address: ______________________________
(Street Name and Number) (City/Borough/Town)

We are conducting a study for the Ontario Ministries of Municipal Affairs and Housing, Community and Social Services, and Health, and Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, on community services and needs of public housing tenants.

The purpose of this study is to increase our understanding as to how senior citizens and families with children, residing in public housing, find help for the kinds of needs that all seniors and families have from time to time. One part of the study calls for a review of available services, and a brief questionnaire to be filled out by agency/organization staff familiar with the projects we are studying.

You were identified as the appropriate respondent knowledgeable about this project and community services by the director of your agency/organization.

The questionnaire is divided into five sections: neighbourhood location and access; needs and support services availability; your role (and agency/organization role) as a service provider in the project and area; general trends and community-wide aspects of services. In answering the questionnaire, if you are unable to give an exact answer to some questions, please provide your best assessment or estimate as to what the answer would be. Also, if in some cases you do not know the answer to a question, please feel free to indicate that as well, since not everyone can be expected to have answers to the wide range of questions we are asking. Please add any extra comments you would like to make.

The survey is strictly confidential, and YOUR ANSWERS WILL NEVER BE SEEN BY ANYONE OTHER THAN OUR RESEARCHERS. NO ONE WILL SEE YOUR ANSWERS, NOT EVEN THE GOVERNMENT MINISTRIES THAT HAVE COMMISSIONED US TO DO THE SURVEY.

Name of respondent(s): ________ Title: ________

Telephone number(s): ______________________________

Address: ______________________________

Agency/organization: ______________________________

PRECODED INFORMATION

__ __ __ __ __ __ __ OH/FP Number (7 digits)

__ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ __ R.C. Number (11 digits)

__ __ __ CMHC Number

SECTION 1: NEIGHBOURHOOD LOCATION, QUALITY OF LIFE AND ACCESS

This section of the questionnaire is designed to obtain information regarding the neighbourhood in which the focus project is located, and related matters.

1. We would like to know what type of neighbourhood the focus project is located in. Would you say it is located: (READ CHOICES AND RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIES)

   (a) ___ In a commercial area
   (b) ___ In a semi-industrial area
   (c) ___ In an older residential area
   (d) ___ In a residential area that is mainly single family homes
   (e) ___ In a residential area that is mainly apartments or townhouses
   (f) ___ In a semi-rural area on the outskirts of town
   (g) ___ Other (specify): ______________________________
   (h) ___ Don't know

2. How would you describe the kinds of people who live in the surrounding neighbourhood? (READ CHOICES AND RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIES)

   (a) ___ Many older retired people (seniors or older couples)
   (b) ___ Many families with teenage children
   (c) ___ Many families with young children
   (d) ___ Many single parent families
   (e) ___ Many single people
   (f) ___ Many transients
   (g) ___ Many ethnic
   (h) ___ Other (specify): ______________________________
   (i) ___ Don't know

3. How would you describe the socio-economic level of households in this neighbourhood? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

   1. Largely middle income
   2. Combination of middle income and low income
   3. Mostly low income

4. How would you rate this neighbourhood as a place for the tenants to live? Would you say that each of the following aspects of the neighbourhood: is excellent, very good, good, fair or poor? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (o))

	Excl.	Very Good	Good	Fair	Poor	Don't Know
(a) Condition of other housing and buildings in your neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Parks and playgrounds nearby	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Local shopping nearby	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Church or synagogue	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Amount of noise from traffic, trains, planes, and industry and things like that	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Quality of air - amount of pollution, dirt and fumes in the air	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Safety from crime against property	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Schools	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Recreation and other facilities in the neighbourhood	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Public Transit	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Safety to go out in the neighbourhood at night	1	2	3	4	5	6
(l) Safety to go out in the neighbourhood in the day	1	2	3	4	5	6
(m) Safety for children	1	2	3	4	5	6
(n) Community services like libraries, day care, social agencies	1	2	3	4	5	6
(o) Safety from violence against people	1	2	3	4	5	6

5. (a) How accessible would you say this project is to public transit? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. No public transit in this area (GO TO Q.5(c))
2. Within one or two blocks
3. Within five blocks
4. More than five blocks away
5. Don't know

5. (b) How frequently is public transit service available here? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

1. Frequent
2. Infrequent
3. Don't know

5. (c) How difficult is it to get around in this neighbourhood or community? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Very difficult
2. Fairly difficult
3. A little difficult
4. Not difficult at all

6. Now we would like to find out about the kinds of facilities available to tenants from this project in the surrounding neighbourhood.

For each of the following (a) to (ab) please indicate if they are within easy walking distance (4 blocks), easy transit, difficult transit, or not available at all. (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (ab))

	Easy Walking	Easy Transit	Difficult Transit	Not Available At All	Don't Know
(a) Parks	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Playgrounds for young children (tot lots, wading pools, swings/slides)	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Play areas for children 5 - 12	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Baseball parks, football, hockey, basketball facilities	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Arenas	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Pools	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Senior Citizen Centre	1	2	3	4	5

	Easy Walking	Easy Transit	Difficult Transit	Not Available At all	Don't Know
(h) Seniors' Activities, Bingo halls, Seniors' Clubs, etc.	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Commercial recreation facilities (e.g. movies, bowling)	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Community Centres (YM/YWCA, municipal recreation centres, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Library	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Corner store/convenience store	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Shopping centre/area	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Drugstore	1	2	3	4	5
(o) A doctor's office	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Hospital emergency	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Medical clinics	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Bank	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Post office	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Church/synagogue	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Restaurant/coffee shop	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Tavern/bar	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Pre-school Child care	1	2	3	4	5
(x) School-age Child care (lunch and after school)	1	2	3	4	5
(y) Schools (junior)	1	2	3	4	5
(z) Schools (high)	1	2	3	4	5
(aa) Summer only programs (day camp, excursions, etc.)	1	2	3	4	5
(ab) Are there any other services or facilities that the tenants use in the surrounding neighbourhood? (specify):					
____________________	1	2	3	4	5
____________________	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 2: NEEDS OF PEOPLE IN THE PROJECT

7. Does your agency/organization provide services to senior citizens, families with children, or both? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Senior citizens (ANSWER QUESTION 8)
    2. Families with children (ANSWER QUESTION 9)
    3. Both (ANSWER QUESTIONS 8 AND 9)

Now we have a few questions about needs of people who live in the project.

8. On the whole, how serious are the following problems for senior citizen tenants of the project? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (l))

	Very serious	Fairly serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	No problem at all	Don't know
(a) Inadequate incomes	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Inability to manage money	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Homemaking, housekeeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Getting around the city/ transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Abuse of alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Abuse of drugs/substances	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Being isolated/lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Getting adequate meals/ nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Poor physical health	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Overuse of medical facilities	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Fear of crime (never going out of apts.)	1	2	3	4	5	6
(l) Any other serious problems for seniors (specify): ____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

(IF PROVIDING SERVICES TO SENIORS ONLY, GO TO QUESTION 10)

9. On the whole, how serious are the following problems for family tenants of the project? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

	Very serious	Fairly serious	Somewhat serious	Not too serious	No problem at all	Don't know
(a) Inadequate incomes	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Inability to manage money	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Homemaking, housekeeping	1	2	3	4	5	6
(d) Getting around the city/ transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6
(e) Abuse of alcohol	1	2	3	4	5	6
(f) Abuse of drugs/substances	1	2	3	4	5	6
(g) Being isolated/lonely	1	2	3	4	5	6
(h) Getting adequate meals/ nutrition	1	2	3	4	5	6
(i) Poor physical health	1	2	3	4	5	6
(j) Lack of parenting skills	1	2	3	4	5	6
(k) Helping children with schoolwork	1	2	3	4	5	6
(l) Disciplining, controlling children	1	2	3	4	5	6
(m) Getting along with the family	1	2	3	4	5	6
(n) Dealing with family problems/ crises	1	2	3	4	5	6
(o) Family violence	1	2	3	4	5	6
(p) Neighbourhood violence	1	2	3	4	5	6
(q) Delinquency of children/youth	1	2	3	4	5	6
(r) Lack of employment for parents	1	2	3	4	5	6
(s) Lack of employment for youth	1	2	3	4	5	6
(t) Lack of skills to obtain employment	1	2	3	4	5	6
(u) Lack of motivation to find employment	1	2	3	4	5	6
(v) Inability to deal with agencies/organizations	1	2	3	4	5	6
(w) Lack of information about programs	1	2	3	4	5	6
(x) Failure to recognize own need for help	1	2	3	4	5	6
(y) Any other serious problems for families (specify): ______________________	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. Overall, would you describe the focus housing project as having: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Many serious problems
    2. Combinations of many minor problems which constitute a major problem
    3. Only occasional problems/crises which are soon over

11. Overall, would you rate the level of all social services provided to the residents of this project as: (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. Excellent
    2. Fair
    3. Poor
    4. Very poor

12. Considering variations in needs, would you say that needs of people in the project are met more effectively, about the same, or less effectively than the needs of people in surrounding neighbourhoods? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER)

    1. More effectively
    2. About the same
    3. Less effectively

(IF "MORE" OR "LESS", PLEASE EXPLAIN WHY)

13. Apart from formal community agencies and other organizations, informal sources of help may be very important to people.

In general, how much would you say that the following help people in this project with needs and problems? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (f))

	A Great deal	A Fair amount	Only a little	Not at all	Don't know
(a) Family	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Neighbours	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Churches	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Schools	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Residents' associations	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Self-help groups (e.g. informal groups meeting together for mutual support and assistance)	1	2	3	4	5

SECTION 3: SUPPORT SERVICES AVAILABLE TO TENANTS FROM COMMUNITY AGENCIES

Now we would like to ask you about the types of community services that are provided by various agencies/organizations to people who live in the focus housing projects. First we would like to find out if the services are available, and second, reasons (if applicable) why any needs are not met.

(IF SERVICES TO SENIORS ONLY, ANSWER QUESTIONS 14, 15, and 16)
(IF FAMILIES ONLY, ANSWER QUESTIONS 17, 18 and 19)
(IF SENIORS AND FAMILIES (MIXED) ANSWER QUESTIONS 14 TO 19, ALL QUESTIONS)

14. (a) (AVAILABILITY QUESTION) First we would like to know about availability of services. By availability, we mean that people who need services can get them, and that housing staff and social agencies can make referrals for services when they are needed. Would you say that the following services, listed as (a) to (y) are: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

FOR SENIOR CITIZENS	Available & meets the needs of most recipients	Available & meets the needs of some recipients	Available & meets the needs of only a few recipients	Not available	Don't Know
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3	4	5
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3	4	5
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3	4	5
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5
(x) Legal services	1	2	3	4	5
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5

(z) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to senior citizen residents of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

________________	1	2	3	4	5
________________	1	2	3	4	5

14. (b) (REASONS NEEDS NOT MET QUESTION)

Answer this question for those items in which a "3" or "4" are given as answers to AVAILABILITY QUESTION 14(a).

Which are the main factors that account for the inability of the (specific) service to meet needs?

(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

	Services need to be provided more freq-uently/ regul ly	Need to serve more people/ demand too great	Wait-ing time for service too long	Costs to users are too high	Tenants unaware of services	Stigma attach-ed to seeking help	Other causes (please specify)
FOR SENIOR CITIZENS							
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(x) Legal services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

(z) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to senior citizen residents of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

Now we are interested in finding out whether services are used more or less by seniors in the focus project than by seniors in the community generally.

15. Are these types of services used more, the same, or less by seniors in this project than in the community in general?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER TO EACH OF (a) THROUGH (y))

FOR SENIOR CITIZENS

	Used More	Same	Used Less
(a) Public health nurse	1	2	3
(b) Physical therapist	1	2	3
(c) Occupational therapist	1	2	3
(d) Homemaking/housekeeping service	1	2	3
(e) Meals on Wheels	1	2	3
(f) Other meal services	1	2	3
(g) Laundry service	1	2	3
(h) Footcare clinic	1	2	3
(i) Hearing clinic	1	2	3
(j) Vision clinic	1	2	3
(k) Dental clinic	1	2	3
(l) Day care clinic	1	2	3
(m) Day hospital	1	2	3
(n) Mental health services	1	2	3
(o) Family counselling services	1	2	3
(p) Nutrition counselling	1	2	3
(q) Counselling about drug or alcohol use	1	2	3
(r) Friendly visiting	1	2	3
(s) Special transportation	1	2	3
(t) Telephone, security or safety check services	1	2	3
(u) Community information and referral services	1	2	3
(v) Housing project staff	1	2	3
(w) Recreational community care, drop in centres	1	2	3
(x) Legal services	1	2	3
(y) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3
(z) Other (specify from question 14(z)			
______________________________	1	2	3
______________________________	1	2	3

16. (a) Considering the services being provided to senior citizen tenants of the focus housing project, which five services would you say are the most important to them? What service or help does each provide? And can you name a contact person at each service who would be knowledgeable about the project and area?
(LIST TOP 5, AND CONTACT PERSON AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IF KNOWN)

	Agency/Organization	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

(b) Are there any special projects, self-help groups or clubs which play a major role in this project by providing important services or supports to seniors? What service or help does each provide? Can you name a contact person knowledgeable about this project or self-help group?

Special Projects/ Self-Help Groups	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number

(IF SENIORS ONLY SERVICES ARE PROVIDED BY YOU TO THIS PROJECT, GO TO QUESTION 20)

SERVICES FOR FAMILIES

17. (a) (AVAILABILITY QUESTION) Firstly, we would like to know about availability of services. By availability, we mean that people who need services can get them, and that housing staff and social agencies can make referrals for services when they are needed. Would you say that the following services, listed as (a) to (x) are: (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (x))

FOR FAMILIES	Available & meets the needs of most recipients	Available & meets the needs of some recipients	Available & meets the needs of only a few recipients	Not available	Don't Know
(a) Health services	1	2	3	4	5
(b) School social workers	1	2	3	4	5
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3	4	5
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3	4	5
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3	4	5
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3	4	5
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3	4	5
(h) Police	1	2	3	4	5
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3	4	5
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3	4	5
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3	4	5
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3	4	5
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3	4	5
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3	4	5
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3	4	5
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3	4	5
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3	4	5
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3	4	5
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5

(y) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to familites of the project? (SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

______________________	1	2	3	4	5
______________________	1	2	3	4	5

17. (b) (REASONS NEEDS NOT MET QUESTION)

Answer this question for those items in which a "3" or "4" are given as answers to AVAILABILITY QUESTION 17(a).

Which are the main factors that account for the inability of the (specific) service to meet needs?
(CIRCLE ALL THAT APPLY)

FOR FAMILIES	Services need to be provided more frequently/ regularly	Need to serve more people/ demand too great	Waiting time for service too long	Costs to users are too high	Tenants unaware of services	Stigma attached to seeking help	Other causes (please specify)
(a) Health services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(b) School social workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(h) Police	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

(y) Are there any other important types of services that we have not listed that are available or unavailable to families of the project?
(SPECIFY AND CIRCLE CODES FOR AVAILABILITY AND REASONS NOT MET)

____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________
____________________	1	2	3	4	5	6	7________

Now we are interested in finding out whether services are used more or less by families in the focus project than by families in the community.

18. Are any of these types of services used more or less by family tenants in this project than in the community in general?
(CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (y))

SERVICES FOR FAMILIES	Used More	Same	Used Less
(a) Health services	1	2	3
(b) School social workers	1	2	3
(c) Homemaker service	1	2	3
(d) Mental health services for adults	1	2	3
(e) Mental health services for children	1	2	3
(f) Pre-school child day care program	1	2	3
(g) Before and after school child care program	1	2	3
(h) Police	1	2	3
(i) Childrens' Aid Society	1	2	3
(j) Parenting education	1	2	3
(k) Family planning (birth control) service	1	2	3
(l) Family counselling service	1	2	3
(m) Big Brothers/Big Sisters	1	2	3
(n) Credit/budget counselling	1	2	3
(o) Job counselling	1	2	3
(p) Educational upgrading program	1	2	3
(q) Nutrition counselling service	1	2	3
(r) Alcohol and drug counselling service	1	2	3
(s) Community information and referral services	1	2	3
(t) Counselling on family law matters	1	2	3
(u) Housing project staff	1	2	3
(v) Family benefits workers	1	2	3
(w) Other income maintenance	1	2	3
(x) Recreational/community drop in centres	1	2	3
(y) Other services (specify):			
______________________________	1	2	3
______________________________	1	2	3

19. (a) Considering the services being provided to family residents of the focus housing project, which five services would you say are the most important to them? What service or help does each provide? And can you name a contact person at each service who would be knowledgeable about the project and area?
(LIST TOP 5, AND CONTACT PERSON AND TELEPHONE NUMBER IF KNOWN) .

	Agency/Organization	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			

(b) Are there any special projects , self-help groups or clubs which play a major role in this project by providing important services or support to family tenants? What service or help does each provide? Can you name a contact person knowledgeable about this project or self-help group?

Special Projects/ Self-Help Groups	Service Provided	Full Name of Contact Person and Telephone Number

20. Why do some tenants not use services they need?
(RANK "1", "2", "3", ETC. IF MORE THAN ONE APPLIED)

(a) ___ Services are too expensive
(b) ___ Services are too far away
(c) ___ Tenants can't be bothered
(d) ___ Tenants are too independent to ask for help
(e) ___ Lack of information
(f) ___ Language difficulty
(g) ___ Stigma attached to seeking help
(h) ___ Tenants deny they have any needs
(i) ___ Lack of motivation
(j) ___ Lack of recognition of needs
(k) ___ Inability to approach agencies/organizations
(l) ___ Don't know
(m) ___ Other (specify): ______________________________
____

21. To what extent do some tenants use services they don't need.
(CIRCLE ONE)

1. Not at all - (GO TO QUESTION 22)
2. Only a little
3. A great deal
4. Don't know

22. Why (if ever) do some tenants use services that they don't need?

23. Do housing project staff help tenants decide on their needs for services? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes (specify how)

____

____

2. No
3. Don't know

24. Do housing project staff help tenants obtain the available services? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. A great deal
2. A fair amount
3. Only a little
4. Not at all
5. Don't know

25. Do you feel that staff of the housing project could do more to help tenants get the services they need? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes, could do more (specify how):

____

____

2. No, that is the individual tenant's responsibility
3. No, that is the responsibility of the service agencies/organizations
4. No, that is the responsibility of family and friends
5. No, staff of the housing project providing sufficient help

26. In general, do you feel that you are able to learn about tenant problems soon enough to take appropriate action? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Usually find out about problems quite soon (GO TO QUESTION 28)
2. Sometimes do not find out about them right away
3. Only hear about problems when crises arise

27. How could these problems be identified earlier?

28. In what ways could project management assist in service delivery in housing projects?

29. Would an on-site multi-service facility in public housing projects aid or improve service delivery? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

30. Is there a neighbourhood planning mechanism (committee, etc.) available in the area where this project is located? (CIRCLE APPROPRIATE ANSWERS)

1. Yes... Is it effective?
    1. Yes, very effective
    2. Yes, somewhat effective
    3. No, not effective
2. No... Is one needed?
    1. Yes ...Why? ____________________
    2. No ....Why? ____________________
3. Don't know

31. How frequently do the following problems present major obstacles to your work or the work of your agency/organization? Would you say often, sometimes, rarely or never? (CIRCLE ONE ANSWER FOR EACH OF (a) TO (j))

	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
(a) Long waiting lists for referrals to other services to be processed	1	2	3	4
(b) Lack of coordination between community services serving residents of the focus housing project	1	2	3	4
(c) Lack of clarity of agencies' roles	1	2	3	4
(d) Clients are unaware of services	1	2	3	4
(e) Clients see services as stigmatizing (stigma attached to seeking help)	1	2	3	4
(f) Clients see services as producing undesirable (in their view) results	1	2	3	4
(g) Lack of client motivation (frustration, apathy)	1	2	3	4
(h) Clients see services as admission of helplessness	1	2	3	4
(i) Lack of client confidence to approach agencies/organizations	1	2	3	4
(j) Inadequacies in the assessment process	1	2	3	4

SECTION 4: YOUR ROLE AND THAT OF YOUR AGENCY IN THE PROJECT AND AREA

Your Role

32. How frequently: (ANSWER EACH OF (a) TO (c) USING THE CODES BELOW)

	At least 2 or 3 times per week	About once a week	2 or 3 times a month	Once a month or so	Less than once a month	Never
(a) Are you in the project for purposes of your service delivery work with specific clients?	1	2	3	4	5	6
(b) Do you meet with housing project staff regarding your service delivery work?	1	2	3	4	5	6
(c) Do you engage in case conferencing with other service providers about the same cases in this project?	1	2	3	4	5	6

What do you see as your major responsibilities and duties?

33. How long have you been:

(a) Working for this agency/organization? ______ (Years) ______ (Months)

(b) Doing this type of work? ______ (Years) ______ (Months)

(c) Working in this neighbourhood? ______ (Years) ______ (Months)

Your Agency/Organization Role

34. (a) Could you please list the range of services offered by your agency/organization?

(b) What type of service does your agency/organization provide in this project?

(c) What services provided by your agency/organization are most effective for:

Seniors:

Families:

(d) What services provided by other agencies/organizations are most effective for:

Seniors:

Families:

35. What area does your agency/organization serve? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Province
2. County
3. Municipality
4. Neighbourhood
5. Project only
6. Province
7. Other (specify): ______________________________

36. How long has your agency/organization been operational in this area?

__________ (Years) __________ (Months)

37. Have there been any changes in the services you provide over this time period? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes (Please explain): ______________________________
____
2. No

38. How many persons are employed by your agency/organization or the branch that serves this project? (SPECIFY NUMBER)

(a) ________ Full-time (all categories professional and support)

(b) ________ Part-time (all categories professional and support)

39. How many volunteers help to provide services in your agency/organization or the branch that serves this project? SPECIFY NUMBER)

(a) ________ Full-time

(b) ________ Part-time

40. Does your agency/organization/branch provide more intense service in this project than in the community as a whole? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes - Why is that?

2. No

41. Do any other agencies/organizations provide the same services or kinds of services in the same area? (CIRCLE ONE)

1. Yes
2. No

42. In the past year, how many clients have been served by your agency/organization or the branch that serves this project? (SPECIFY NUMBER)

________ in the project

________ in the overall area your agency/organization serves

44. What changes in services to this project, and in your agency/organization or the branch that serves this project's workload/staff requirements have occurred in the past five years? (PLEASE EXPLAIN CHANGES RELATING TO SENIORS AND FAMILIES)

CHANGES FOR SENIORS

CHANGES FOR FAMILIES

45. (a) In the next five years, do you anticipate any significant changes in the degrees of independence among the residents of this project? (CIRCLE ONE NUMBER AND SPECIFY)

1. Yes, expect residents of project to become more independent (specify): ________________
2. Yes, expect residents of project to become less independent (specify): ________________
3. No, expect residents of project to stay about the same (specify): ________________

(b) Why is that?

THANK YOU FOR FILLING OUT THE QUESTIONNAIRE, AND FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE WITH THIS IMPORTANT STUDY.